1971

Emerging Concepts of Teacher Education in Agriculture.

Robert Reese Martin
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

EMERGING CONCEPTS OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Vocational Agricultural Education

by
Robert R. Martin
B.S., Texas Technological University, 1954
M.Ed., Texas Technological University, 1955
May, 1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation is gratefully extended to the following persons who participated in and contributed to this study:

Dr. C. L. Mondart, Sr., graduate committee chairman, for his untiring guidance and encouragement throughout the writer's graduate program at Louisiana State University;

Drs. James Hutchinson, Charlie Curtis, J. C. Atherton and Donald Thrasher, other members of the writer's doctoral committee;

Dr. T. J. Stanly, Head, Department of Agriculture, Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, Texas, for his kind assistance during the study;

Drs. Barton Farthing and Kenneth Koonce, Department of Experimental Statistics, Louisiana State University, for their interest and help extended the writer in the statistical methods employed and interpretation of data;

The 44 teacher educators, 95 teachers of vocational agriculture, 116 supervisors, 43 principals and 42 superintendents whose participation made this study possible; and

Mrs. Mary McMinn, Mrs. Alice Anders, Mrs. Robbie Buck and Miss Leta Ann Petty for their service in typing of the manuscript.

Expressions of sincere gratitude are due the writer's family -- wife, Patsy; and daughters, Reesa and Rhonda, whose patience, faith and encouragement during the prolonged period of graduate study made it possible for him to achieve the terminal degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to determine emerging concepts of teacher education in agriculture. A knowledge of the role concepts held by individuals who have administrative and operational responsibilities in over-all program function should prove valuable in determining needed adjustments in current undergraduate training programs for prospective graduates in agricultural education. Therefore, an attempt was made to rank current teacher education functions in agriculture as perceived by five professional education groups: teacher educators, vocational agricultural teachers, supervisors, principals and superintendents.

Procedure

The descriptive survey method of research utilizing the questionnaire technique, was used in this study. Questionnaires consisting of 11 role items and 115 activities were mailed to 48 teacher educators, 96 teachers of vocational agriculture, 96 high school principals, 96 public school superintendents, 46 state supervisors of vocational agriculture and 68 area or district supervisors of vocational agriculture.

The questionnaire was first submitted to a group of 22 persons for a critical review of the items and activities. All but one jury member responded.

An evaluation was obtained for each item from each participating group by calculating the means from the responses to the activities listed under each item. The analysis of variance procedure was used as a test of significient differences among these groups. Where differences were noted, the responses of the teacher educators were compared with those of the other four groups and the responses of the vocational agricultural teachers were compared with those of the remaining three groups, teacher educators excluded, to see if they held different concepts from the supervisors and administrators of public schools. A third comparison gave the principal's evaluations with respect to those of the supervisors and superintendents, while the fourth compared the average responses of the supervisors and the superintendents. The F-test was used in determining the degree of differences that existed. Finally, the null hypothesis was used against each test and was accepted or rejected at the .05 level of confidence.

Findings

Significant differences were found to exist among the responses to 53 of the 115 role activities selected for this study. Four comparisons were made of these 53 activities to determine the sources of differences. Upon comparison, it was found that the teacher educators differed with the other groups on 42 activities, while the agricultural teachers differed with the remaining three groups on only six activities. The principals' responses were significantly different from those of the supervisors and superintendents with respect to 14 activities, and the supervisors and superintendents were at odds on 16 of the 53 activities.

None of the eleven role items used in this study were rated Very Important by an average of all responses of the participants. Six role items were perceived to be Important by the average of the five groups of educators. These were: Technical Agriculture; Professional Education; Program Flexibility; Student Teaching and Professional Internship; Job Placement; and Organizations. Five role items were assigned average ratings of Little Importance. These were: Selection and Recruitment of Candidates; General Education; State Programs and Certification; Cooperative Personnel and Agencies; and Assessment of First Year Teaching. No role item was determined to have No Value by the participating groups.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The developments of the past decade clearly point to the realization that agriculture is a vast and complex industry which is demanding rapid and dramatic changes in the roles of educational institutions. The full impact of these changes has been felt in the field of vocational agriculture across the country and in the pre-service programs that provide the training for teachers of vocational agriculture.

With the passage of the National Vocational Education Act of 1963, the primary purpose of vocational agriculture was drastically changed. Under the new legislation the program was expanded to include training for all occupations where knowledge and skill in agricultural subjects was found to be a requirement for job entry. The role of the agricultural teacher changed profoundly. Those in service needed retraining to function more efficiently in their new role, while prospective teachers required additional training to assume the added responsibilities they would surely encounter.

These events indicate that traditional pre-service programs in agricultural education no longer adequately meet the needs of vocational agricultural teachers -- that the role of the teacher educator has also changed. Current programs should be restructured to reflect the needs of the students. Almost overnight there has been a need demonstrated for:

1. Training special teachers for multiple teacher departments,
2. Broadening the training base for teachers of single teacher departments,
3. Preparation of prospective teachers concerning nonfarm agricultural occupations,
4. Preparation of prospective teachers to train the disadvantaged,
5. New types of in-service programs to supplement training of teachers on the job,
6. Preparation of new kinds of teaching materials, and
7. Research focused on new demands made upon vocational agriculture.

Presently, most departments of agricultural education in the United States are revising their pre-service programs. Until now, little research has been accomplished in this area. For the most part, teacher educators have attempted reorganization without the benefit of information obtained by organized research.

To meet today's requirements of properly relating pre-service training to job demand of agricultural teachers, teacher educators in agricultural education should move to new patterns that are based on common guidelines and counsel from others similarly engaged, rather than personal opinion. What role should the teacher educator assume in an attempt to achieve this goal? It is hoped that this study, "Emerging Concepts of Teacher Education in Agriculture," will assist members of the profession in answering that question.

Statement of Problem

The primary function of teacher education at the undergraduate level in vocational agricultural education is to provide a suitable atmosphere in which prospective agricultural teachers may prepare to successfully assume their roles as high school teachers.

There should be no conflict between the role of the agricultural teacher and the teacher training program designed for his preparation. A training program stressing production agriculture, or even a program offering limited preparation in the area of nonfarm agricultural occupations, may not provide the environment for developing teachers for service in today's schools. Further support for change in the emerging role of the agricultural teacher is a training atmosphere which takes into account the shifting of education from the culturally advantaged to the disadvantaged. How to provide a program so that the pre-service training experiences of agricultural teachers and their functions as a teacher complement one another has become a problem of the first magnitude because, in reality, conflict now exists as a result of the changing role of agricultural teachers.

Throughout the past 53 years of vocational agriculture, teacher education has been an important part of the service. Many training programs have been conceived. Some have died, and new ones have been born; others have been considered great, and some have simply endured. Meanwhile, agriculture and vocational agriculture have continued to change. At least two trends that have become established are (1) the training needs of prospective farmers have changed drastically as farms

grow larger, demanding more capital and increased management capabilities, and (2) more rural boys look to the cities for nonfarm agricultural occupations if they desire to stay in agriculture. Teacher training institutions constitute the only agency capable of translating these two realities into training situations for teachers who must face them.

It is generally assumed that determining what goes into a teacher training program is a responsibility of teacher educators, but they have not always agreed on what constitutes a functional program. This is particularly true at present because of the need for the integration of production agriculture and preparation in the area of nonfarm agriculture. This continues to be an unsolved problem which presents a fruitful field for research.

Questions teacher educators are now concerned with appear in the following areas:

1. How can teachers be prepared to train farmers and farm workers in light of farm size increase and complexity of operations?

2. How can teachers be prepared to train boys for nonfarm agricultural jobs?

3. How can teachers be prepared for effective service with the disadvantaged?

4. How can teachers be prepared for effective service at the post-high school level for both farmers and nonfarmers?

5. How can teachers be prepared to assume the broadened leadership roles that will be demanded of them?

What are the emerging concepts directing the attacks teacher educators are now making on these problem areas at the pre-service training level? Clearly, a reform movement closely allied to changes

in teacher role is underway in teacher training. How do teacher educators, supervisors, teachers and administrators perceive the emerging role of the training program at the pre-service level?

Hypothesis

A clear understanding of the role that the vocational agriculture teacher will be expected to play is necessary before the pre-service training program can adequately fulfill its obligation. Teacher educators in agriculture are aware of the urgent need for revision of their programs. The graduates of these programs must become more closely attuned to today's job demands if they expect to perform satisfactorily.

Significant among professional individuals who hold important concepts of a thorough pre-service training program in agricultural education are (1) the teacher educators in agricultural education, (2) the teachers of vocational agriculture, (3) the state supervisors of vocational agriculture, (4) the area or district supervisors of vocational agriculture, and (5) the principals and superintendents of public schools offering vocational agriculture. Therefore, it follows that how well the pre-service curriculum meets the needs of those it serves may be influenced by the degree of consensus among these individuals who are familiar with the conceived functions of the program.

Supported by literature related to the study and professional experiences of the writer, the following hypotheses are proposed:

1. A consensus exists among professional educators, who have an interest in vocational agriculture, upon which a pre-service program of teacher education in agriculture could be structured.

2. The groups participating in this study have similar concepts relative to expected performance of teacher education in agricultural education.

3. The responses of the teacher educators in agricultural education will be similar to the average of the responses of the other four groups.

4. Excluding teacher educators, the responses of the teachers of vocational agriculture will not be significantly different from the average of the responses of the other three groups.

5. The responses of the high school principals will not be significantly different from the combined responses of the supervisors and superintendents.

6. Where the responses of the supervisors are compared with those of the superintendents, no significant differences will exist.

Limitations of Study

This study was limited to the following professional education groups:

1. All of the major land-grant institutions of the 48 contiguous United States offering teacher education in agricultural education. Responses were requested from department chairmen or staff members appointed by them.

2. Vocational agricultural teachers representing 16 states randomly drawn from each of the four regions of the United States (four states from each region). State directors of vocational agriculture were asked to supply the names of six individuals from their respective states.

3. All of the state directors of vocational agriculture of the 48 contiguous United States.

4. All of the area or district supervisors representing the 16 randomly drawn states.

5. Principals of public schools offering vocational agriculture, six from each of the 16 randomly drawn states, as selected by the state director of vocational agriculture of each state.

6. Superintendents of public schools offering vocational agriculture, six from each of the 16 randomly drawn states, as selected by the state director of vocational agriculture of each state.

For convenience in tabulating the data from the participants, they were placed in the following groups:

1. Teacher Educators (TE)
2. Vocational Agricultural Teachers (VAT)
3. Supervisors (SPV)
4. Principals (PR)
5. Superintendents (SPT)

Procedure and Treatment of Data

This study was designed to obtain from vocational agricultural workers an opinion of what is considered to be the emerging role of teacher education programs at the pre-employment level. It was assumed that changes in the role of the agricultural teacher, following the passage of the National Vocational Education Act of 1963, would tend to influence teacher educators in adjusting their training programs to better prepare teachers to meet the new demands now made upon them. The main intent of the study was not to make a determination as to the emerging roles of teacher education, but determine how vocational agriculture workers at all levels rate the importance of role items, together with role activities, now assumed or under development as a part of curricula adjustments.

By means of a review of related literature, conferences with graduate committee members and other leaders in agricultural education, a group of 11 role items was developed, along with 115 role activities each of which was classified under the appropriate role item. These lists were submitted to a panel of judges for refinement. Afterwards,

they were used to structure a data gathering instrument. Provisions were made in the instrument for rating each role activity by the five groups of worker-subjects selected for the study: teacher educators, vocational agricultural teachers; vocational supervisors; public school principals and superintendents. Composite ratings of the role activities by the five groups of participants were used to establish the importance of each role activity. The following rating scale was used to determine the importance of each activity as perceived by the five professional groups:

Undecided	No Value	Little Importance	Important	Very Important

Additionally, each of the 11 role items provided an open end opportunity for comment. These comments were categorized and are found in Appendix C.

Useable questionnaires were received from 44 teacher educators, 95 teachers of vocational agriculture, 43 high school principals, 42 public school superintendents, 36 state supervisors of vocational agriculture, 40 area supervisors of vocational agriculture, and 39 local and district vocational supervisors. The names of participants were furnished by the state supervisors representing 16 randomly drawn states - four from each region of the United States.

The analysis of variance statistical procedure was used to determine whether significant differences existed between ratings made by each of the five groups. The null hypothesis that no true differences existed between the responses of the groups was tested by dividing the "among means" variance by the "within means" variance, and the resulting

ratio (F) compared with the largest possible number that could appear by chance. The F-ratio test of significance does not tell which mean differ significantly, but that at least one is reliably different from some others. The level of confidence adopted for this study was .05, or the null hypothesis was accepted or rejected, depending on whether or not a difference of this size would appear more or less than 5 in 100 trials. When the F was not significant, there was no further testing, as this was an indication that there were no mean differences greater than that which could be expected by chance. Where significant differences existed among the responses of the five professional groups, four comparisons were made. These four comparisons are described as follows:

1. The responses of the teacher educators were compared with the average responses of the other four groups (Comparison 1).

2. The responses of the vocational agricultural teachers were compared with the average responses of the three remaining groups -- teacher educators excluded (Comparison 2).

3. The responses of the principals were compared with the average responses of the supervisors and superintendents (Comparison 3).

4. The responses of the supervisors were compared with the responses of the superintendents (Comparison 4).

These comparisons were made in an attempt to furnish some indication of the sources of the differences.

As a means of evaluating the relative importance of the 11 role items used in the questionnaire, the values assigned the role activities under each item were used to calculate role item means for each group of participants. This was accomplished by adding the average responses

for the activities in each item for each group, and then dividing this sum by the number of activities listed under the role item. Since there was a fair and representative sampling of professional educators used in the study, it was assumed that their responses to the 115 activities would constitute a valid basis upon which a reasonable evaluation of the role items could be made. Based on the participants responses to the activities and the procedure described, a rank order of the 11 role items was made.

Data furnished by the questionnaires were tabulated and summarized in narrative form. In addition to portraying the results of differences in the responses of the five groups of educators, these data were used to show:

1. A rank order of the 11 teacher education role items was made, based on the evaluations assigned the activities under each item. Although the respondents were not asked to evaluate the 11 role items per se, it was assumed that reasonable comparisons could be made from the mean responses to the role items.

2. An account of the four comparisons by role item was made to reveal the sources of the differences between the groups that were compared.

3. A listing was made of the activities which received a rating of (5) - Very Important - by at least 65 per cent of any group. This observation pointed to the activities that were considered to be of greatest importance to the respondents.

4. A listing was made of the activities which received a rating of (2) - No Importance - by at least 15 per cent of any group. This observation revealed those activities considered to be of least importance to the participants.

Definition of Terms

As an aid to a better understanding of the concepts held by the five professional education groups, it was necessary to define several

terms as related to the study. A list of these terms and their definitions is as follows:

1. Agricultural Competency. The term refers to a skill and/or ability in, and/or a knowledge of one or more of the areas of plant and soil science, animal and poultry science, agricultural chemicals, agricultural business management, marketing, and agricultural mechanics.

2. Analysis of Variance (9). Analysis of variance is a statistical procedure for testing experimental hypotheses in problems in which the significance of the differences among several means is desired.

3. Cooperative Part-Time Training. The term refers to the involvement of students in the duties of an occupation simultaneously with their enrollment in a student program. The teacher helps supervise the employment of the student and relates his classroom studies to the needs of the industry.

4. Course of Study. The term refers to all of the courses in a subject matter area and to the supervised cooperative occupational experiences included in a curriculum.

5. Curriculum. A curriculum is a group of courses and planned experiences which a student has under the guidance of the school or college.

6. Disadvantaged. A group of populations which differ from each other in several ways but have in common such characteristics as low economic status, low social status, low educational achievement, tenuous or no employment, limited participation in community organizations and limits of ready potential for upward mobility.

7. Education. Education is learning through experiences. These experiences may be planned and offered by the school, or they may be encountered outside the school. Education should result in continuous growth toward appropriate and reasonable goals.

8. General Education. Education that is primarily for all students, regardless of their major or field of specialization.

9. Position. The term refers to the label given to the occupational activities of employees having identical or similar duties.

10. Pre-Service Training. Pre-service training refers to the entire undergraduate course of study in agricultural education.

11. Production Agriculture. Production agriculture is the term used to describe the production of crops and livestock in agriculture.

12. Professional Education. Education which has as its primary objective the assisting of students to become more proficient in teaching, exclusive of general education and technical agriculture.

13. Professional Internship. Professional internship refers to that part of the pre-service training in lieu of, or as a part of, the student teaching experience, whereby the student experiences actual working conditions in a professional organization.

14. Role Activity. The term refers to one of 115 activities selected for this study and listed under 11 role items. These activities are conceived to be a function of teacher education in agriculture.

15. Role Item. The term refers to one of 11 major divisions of the pre-service curriculum considered to be a function of teacher education in agriculture.

16. Skilled Employee. The title refers to an individual who possesses a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of processes involved in a technical occupation. The individual may exercise considerable independent judgment, use a high degree of manual dexterity, and in some instances, exercise extensive responsibility.

17. Technical Agriculture. Education provided by members of the agricultural or engineering faculty and designed primarily for agricultural majors.

18. Work Experience. Work experience is that part of the school program through which the student renders useful services or produces goods through participation in work activities in the community.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Through a survey of the literature and research concerning teacher education in agriculture, it was revealed that few comprehensive studies have been made since the passage of the National Vocational Education Act of 1963. There have, however, been numerous state and departmental staff studies on the subject during the past decade. Persons responsible for planning and carrying out training programs in agricultural education have been aware of needed changes for many years, and a number of significant innovations have occurred throughout the country.

New patterns of development in the changing role of the vocational agricultural teacher have pointed up the rather urgent need for providing flexibility in his pre-service training so that he may function more realistically under today's social conditions. While curriculum reform has long been recognized as a vital need in agricultural education, major emphasis continues, by and large, to focus on traditional college courses and credits, preserving the identity of the training curricula.

Dr. C. L. Mondart, Sr. (43:7) stated that there is general agreement among educators that upgrading teacher training must begin with purposes -- not procedures. He continued that under the conditions that most of us operate, there are at least two options to consider:

1. We can continue to turn out teachers qualified to advance students who can conform to the "system" and be uniform in kind and outlook; or

2. We can develop a teacher who is flexible enough to make alternatives available to his students.

Institutions of public education have provided training in agriculture for many years. Federal endorsement of agricultural education in 1917 caused it to spread over the nation as a part of the regular high school program, and also established the basis for which teachers could be trained to man the service.

The role of the teacher trainer and the agricultural teacher remained relatively unchanged for over forty years . . . to train for proficiency in farming occupations. As early as 1954, there was a noticeable recognition of the need for vocational training in off-farm occupations. In 1954, Schaller (36:207) offered that teacher educators in agriculture should change their theory that the primary objective of vocational agriculture was to prepare boys for farming. Although the need for revision in the pre-service curricula was evident throughout the nation, teacher educators encountered difficulty initiating program changes. Several reasons that have been mentioned are:

1. They are traditionally prone to resist change themselves

2. Their functions have been spelled out by Federal legislation that provides program funding

3. Traditional state program restrictions

4. Institutional restrictions

With the advent of the "space age" in 1957, and the resulting emphasis that was placed on relevant vocational training programs, it

was apparent that widespread reform was in need. Subsequently, the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (16) was drafted and passed. This act spelled out that funds

> . . . allotted for agricultural education may be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupation involves work of the farm or of the farm home, and such education may be provided without directed or supervised practices on a farm.

This broadened concept of vocational education in agriculture soon resulted in new directions for high school programs and rapid development of vocational programs at the post-high school level. The 1963 Vocational Education Act recognized changes in the vast agricultural industry and its passage indicated that the public was committed to a new responsibility.

In regard to the educational needs of youth, Barbara Kemp (14:45) expressed that one of the greatest obligations of a democratic society is to give its youth the opportunity to acquire knowledge and skills, and to put them to use when acquired. The urgent need of reorganizatior for more relevant vocational training programs in vocational education was clearly recognized in a special study prepared for the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education in 1962. Brookover and Nosow (46:16) suggested that:

> Skills in reading, mathematics, and other general education fields are essential for acquiring specific vocational competence and the higher levels of education needed for many occupations. It is therefore essential for the schools to increase their efficiency in teaching the fundamental school subjects to all students. The early school leaver who has not acquired the basic skills in not only unable to find satisfactory permanent employment but is also greatly handicapped in acquiring specific vocational training as an adult.

Russell L. Miller (33:84) expressed concern over current educational problems when he said:

> It appears that tomorrow's society is enrolled as today's students in yesterday's colleges. It is quite evident that students have changed more than the colleges. Students today are more aware of the world around them. Some of the problems of today's students were not the problems at all ten or twenty years ago.

Similar concern was depicted in an editorial statement by Karl Shapiro (38:16c), poet and professor at the University of California, in Davis:

> . . . Students . . . today, according to my experience all over the United States, can no longer spell, can no longer construct a simple English sentence, much less a paragraph, and cannot speak.
>
> We have the most inarticulate generation of college students in our history and this may well account for their mass outbreaks of violence. They have no more intelligent way to express themselves.

The writer is sympathetic with much of the discontent that has been shown for vocational training during the past decade. Through his personal experiences and a review of literature for this study, he sees a certain amount of justification for rejection and even defiance by students of institutions established to prepare them for goals with out-dated courses and credits. The current generation wants participation in the educational process, not packages. The students want problems, not answers. They want probes, not exams. They want making, not matching. They want insights, not classified data. To many Americans, education in general is being made a collective scapegoat for most of the social unrest in the country. The statement by Burkett (26:6) that

" . . . schools have never been given a fair chance because of inadequate resources and lack of commitment and leadership at local, state and national levels" would somewhat defend educators, provided they move quickly to maximize the contributions of the schools to the solution of these problems.

Providing a new training program for agricultural education in the light of today's needs is a problem which opens up a new area for scientific investigation. Until now, little research has been accomplished. For the most part, teacher educators are attempting a reorganization without the benefit of information obtained by organized research; in fact, action taken or now under consideration is more likely to be based upon personal considerations rather than by use of common guidelines, or without the benefit of counsel from others similarly engaged. It appears that much of the research that has been done in the area of job analysis and skills required could be profitably employed in restructuring curricula in agricultural education.

R. E. Christal (47:27), Chief of the Occupational and Development Branch of the U. S. Air Force, made an observation which has profound implication when he said " . . . more time should be devoted to identifying curriculum elements which can be safely eliminated or given reduced emphasis in training programs. Occupational survey data provide a way to quickly identify skills being taught which are unlikely to be utilized by graduates."

Teacher education in agricultural education should be defended as having been functional in the past, even though pre-service training

was almost totally directed toward farmer or production training prior to 1960. As nonfarm agricultural occupations have emerged and been identified during the past decade, training for these off-farm jobs was thrust, almost overnight, on the vocational agricultural teacher and the agricultural teacher educator who was largely responsible for his pre-service preparation.

With regard to redirected programs, Dr. W. Howard Martin (42) discussed four major areas of concern for which "agricultural subject matter" has import and which appear promising as the dominant features of the new image of agricultural education in the world for some time to come. These areas are (1) agricultural production and marketing, (2) natural resource management, (3) environmental development and (4) agricultural research and service. These four areas, he suggested, may be related to traditional discipline areas without great difficulty. Hence, they pose minimal threats to traditional subject areas, and they should provide for the necessary flexibility in interpretation at state and local levels. They could also provide a framework within which individuals could shape their personal objectives.

In his lecture to the 1969 American Vocational Association Convention in Boston, Massachusetts, Dr. Martin more specifically stated:

> A new image of agricultural education must come forth which gives more accent to life work as something to which youth can commit themselves. Persons with agricultural interests and talents do and will continue to contribute to generally recognized goals. These significant goals need accent.
>
> Much change in substance has occurred since 1963. New courses and curricula materials seem to flow across one's desk at increasing rates. Perhaps with a better image they would become more coherent. At the moment the impression is one of

> striving to get a prescription covering every possible job in agriculture or allied area with little regard to more meaningful and enduring central purposes.
>
> The very abundance of materials and ideas, of course, is somewhat overwhelming for supervisors and teachers as well as for teacher educators. While a meaningful frame of reference would be of assistance, this alone will not insure adequate substance in secondary or post-secondary institutions. In secondary schools, agricultural education faces the prospect of further erosion in the time students spend in the study of agriculture. An increasing proportion of students may enroll for one or two years only.

Cardozier (1) reflected the importance of emerging concepts in agricultural education when he said:

> Change in teacher education is manifested in behavior of the teachers prepared. Changes which make no difference in behavior are probably inconsequential. Those which lead to pre-determined improvement in behavior are fortuitous. Work should be directed to bring about pre-determined improvements. This implies a continuing task of defining desired behavior (the model of proper role), and developing a program of teacher education in terms of maximizing its influence on students in these directions. It further implies the existence of an organization working toward the ideal of maximum effectiveness.

In an editorial in 1969, Nelson Grote (29:8) concluded with:

> Unless we in vocational education can demonstrate unequivocally that we have the ability to develop a delivery system and the resources to make it effective in meeting the needs of all people; unless we are flexible enough to adjust to changing job requirements -- and unless we wake up to the fact that we can ill afford to alienate ourselves from other phases of education and/or levels of instruction -- then we face the possibility of another state and/or federal agency assuming the leadership in manpower training and development.

Warmbrod (44) compared the current redirecting of programs and expansion of purpose to the alterations which occurred in agricultural education during the period prior to and immediately following the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 (15). He noted that passage

of Public Law 88-210 (16), The National Vocational Education Act of 1963, provided a similar stimulus and provided a much broader concept of agricultural education. An even wider concept was facilitated by enactment of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (17).

Studies have suggested that there are similarities in the competency requirements of farm and off-farm occupations. Warmbrod further stated that:

> . . . it is evident that much of the subject matter content needed by persons preparing for work in production agriculture is also appropriate for persons preparing for employment in occupations in business and industry which involve knowledge and skill in agriculture. Also evident is the finding that competencies needed by workers in farm and non-farm occupations are not synonymous. The latter needs emphasis. It is clear . . . that programs designed for persons entering production agriculture are not sufficient to meet the needs of persons entering non-farm agricultural occupations.

Also, there is evidence to support similarities in competencies required by persons in different agricultural occupations. Likewise, subject matter needed by persons in different off-farm occupations may be similar.

Baker 22:136) made a study of the off-farm agricultural employment opportunities in Alabama in 1965. At least 20 per cent of the persons employed in agriculturally related businesses and industries needed agricultural training or background. His study revealed that the more technical the occupations, the greater the difficulty encountered in filling the vacancy.

In a Louisiana study conducted by Dale Reed (52:160), an attempt was made to determine the beginning teachers' evaluation of their preservice programs. Among the conclusions drawn from the study were:

1. Beginning and experienced teachers had a high degree of difficulty in the area of developing work experience programs in off-farm agriculture.

2. Classroom supervision of beginning teachers was very limited.

3. Teacher preparation programs need strengthening in areas of teaching farm mechanics and young and adult farmers.

Recommendations based on his findings included:

1. Pre-service programs should be continually evaluated and coordinated with the high school vocational agricultural program.

2. More emphasis should be placed on student teaching experiences to more fully prepare trainees for the job and problems they will face as a vocational agricultural teacher.

3. Teacher trainers should visit their graduates at least two times during the first year on the job, and once during the second year.

4. Teacher trainers and area supervisors should conduct group conferences with beginning teachers during the first year of teaching.

5. Workshops, short courses and seminars should be provided in professional and technical areas of agriculture for all teachers, meeting in groups throughout the state.

In his study "The Emerging Role of the Teacher of Vocational Agriculture," Alfred Stewart (53:137) concluded that teacher educators in agricultural education should provide comprehensive instruction in the various roles of the agricultural teacher. He recommended that, due to differences in role concepts held by teacher educators and others close to the program, conferences should be utilized to adjust the differences.

A curriculum study by Jabro (51:248) involving land-grant colleges and state universities throughout the United States revealed

many weaknesses in the pre-service curricula in agricultural education. He summarized these as follows:

1. Place greater emphasis and provide more work in the following areas:
   a. Farm Management
   b. Farm Machinery & Mechanics
   c. Soil Science
   d. Crop Production
   e. Horticulture
   f. Farm Forestry
   g. Animal Science
   h. Biological Science
   i. Communications
   j. Humanities
   k. Mathematics
   l. Physical Science
   m. Professional Education
2. Improve the quality of teaching and the content of courses.
3. Emphasize practical courses for prospective teachers and off-campus courses to up-grade teachers who are presently employed.
4. Provide flexibility in the selection of courses by students particularly in fields of technical agriculture.
5. Provide for greater specialization in fields of technical agriculture.
6. Lengthen the period of supervised student teaching.
7. Establish a more intensive follow-up program of beginning teachers.
8. Organize original research programs in order for undergraduates to gain experience in using research methods and in using results of research in teaching.
9. Initiate or expand programs of summer experience for prospective teachers of vocational candidates.
10. Improve the methods used in selecting prospective vocational agricultural teacher candidates.

From the vast coverage indicated in item number one, it is evident that the summary included weaknesses from all parts of the nation. Obviously, an individual program in a particular college or university would not need such a comprehensive revision.

Through the review of considerable material, such as journal periodicals and staff studies, the writer obtained information which he considered pertinent to the study. The decade of the sixties clearly pointed up the following areas of innovation that are proving important to teacher educators in agriculture:

1. Training for off-farm agricultural occupations was thrust upon agricultural education as a new responsibility.
2. Supervised practice was reorganized to include cooperative occupational experiences in addition to farmer production programs.
3. Many and varied kinds of teaching materials were created using new content, format and style.
4. Some vocational educators began to envision vocational education as multi-level occupational education.

These innovations or changes have been a part of many in-service programs and conferences at all levels. Agricultural education leaders have been in general agreement that new directions in the field dictate corresponding changes in the pre-service preparation for those who will be responsible for carrying out the new programs. Significant changes have been relatively slow, however, as there has been little evidence from which somewhat major change could be based. Teacher educators are faced with the problem of not knowing precisely what kind of product is wanted and needed. C. C. Scarborough (50:7) aptly stated that " . . . we are now at a point of trying to know what to hang on to, what to revise, what to discard and what new programs to start. How well we make these decisions will determine the future, if any, for vocational agriculture."

As a possible means of recognizing some of the new trends in teacher preparation in agriculture, the following were gathered from the literature and are here presented:

1. Reorganization and review of objectives

2. Realignment of curricula

3. Option Approach - overall curricula in:
   a. Agricultural Science
   b. Agri-business
   c. Agricultural Technology

   Agricultural Education students elect one and receive a degree in the one elected, with a major in Agricultural Education. Fewer, broader departments consolidate introductory courses, allowing more opportunities for specialization in the last two years.

4. Reduction of required courses in Technical Agriculture increases the number of electives to allow students to pursue specific subject matter areas.

5. Addition of courses specifically designed to acquaint teachers with vast opportunities in the agri-business industry.

6. Addition of courses in occupational information and vocational guidance.

7. Acceptance of students of any major provided they fulfill professional education requirements.

8. Acceptance of double majors.

9. Acceptance of graduates with provisional certificates provided they agree to complete professional education requirements.

10. Recruitment of graduates who are working in agricultural business or industry.

11. Improved quality of instruction in colleges and universities
    a. Offer course in college teaching (experienced)
    b. Offer course in college teaching (inexperienced)
    c. Conduct seminars for improvement of instruction
    d. Offer awards for outstanding teaching
    e. Employ team-teaching and educational TV techniques
    f. Student evaluation of instruction

In the "Analysis for Curriculum Development in Vocational Education," Larson (49) noted that curriculum development based on employment needs is the essence of effective payroll education for the youth and adult in today's world. In the Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, curriculum development has been identified as a needed force. Requirements of the employers are essential to identifying content for occupational and vocational education.

With the realization that education for employment must be geared to the needs of the employer, renewed interest has been exhibited in the role of analysis for curriculum development since the Second World War. Although job analysis has been used for many years, resource materials are very limited on the subject. Most of what has been written reflects a narrow rather than a broad approach, resulting in a frame-of-reference usually directed to a specific vocational service or occupation.

In a study by Raiford Williams (54:10) it was noted that the primary changes in agriculture in recent years which have influenced vocational education have been the specialization of agricultural production and the identification of off-farm occupations in the agricultural industry. In the past decade of specialization, automation, and economic progress, many workers were released from farm jobs. Farmers became more dependent on services and supplies from the agricultural industry.

In his study, Williams emphasized that:

> . . . industry personnel expressed an interest in and a desire to be more directly involved in determining vocational training needs and developing instructional materials for the various vocational programs. It appears that school officials should make a greater effort to involve representatives of industry in activities related to vocational programming. Some activities suggested are (1) more surveys to assess training needs, (2) active participation by qualified representatives of industry as visiting teachers, (3) more use of industry facilities for field trips, (4) use of mobile equipment for demonstrations and for school laboratory use on a temporary loan basis, and (5) use of industry facilities as training centers for supervised work experiences.

Williams continued that:

> . . . the strength and objectives of the curriculum lie in providing an effective laboratory experience along with adequate occupational experience and a sound understanding of principles and practices of the industry. The study purposes provide for the development of suggested laboratories, supervised occupational experience activities as well as a course of study based on the judgment of employees concerning the needs of their employees.

He concluded with the observation that:

> . . . well-equipped laboratories with sufficient facilities for all students to perform the laboratory work are a necessary prerequisite to quality instruction in any vocational course. Classroom work becomes much more meaningful when accompanied by practical laboratory exercises. Providing up-to-date equipment is fundamental to the success of instruction.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 identified disadvantaged youth, or youth with special needs, as those who have academic, socio-economic, of other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational programs. The problem of providing challenging programs for these youth appears to be more acute in certain, defined areas. The writer believes that it is most important for educators to identify these youth and their needs and devote adequate time to planning individual, realistic programs for them.

Dr. Stewart quoted J. L. O'Brian (34:54) and listed the following as potential programs for the deprived:

1. An educational program specially designed to prepare this segment of the population for useful and productive lives. To achieve this goal requires teachers with competencies to work effectively with these youths, and for teacher-training programs to prepare these teachers; a program for the youth with special needs must begin with the student's attained level of achievement and must provide these culturally starved youngsters with experiences which will broaden their intellectual horizons.

2. A program for developing skills is also considered essential. The skill development aspect should provide the student with numerous saleable skills in several job families and of varying levels -- some, of course, on the low level. There must be opportunity for students to move up the educational ladder and engage in the study of skilled and technical level occupations where aptitude and educational achievements permit.

In his address to the 1970 AACTE Annual Convention, Paul Briggs (6:39) talked at length concerning vocational training for the poor. He said that:

> Never before in American history have we had such a concentration of the poor in our cities as we have now. And this has been going up year after year.

He continued with:

> We have a responsibility in the area of employment. We must provide this generation with the kind of skills that allow them to go into the marketplace and have something to sell. And on this we part company from teacher education groups, perhaps further than on any other issue. Because there is practically no teacher education program in America that is realistically preparing teachers to train youth for the skills that are saleable. Take a look at the standards you have for accreditation of public schools. They almost completely write off any training programs that deal realistically with the development of skills.

A reference to training the disadvantaged was made by Haubrich (12:29) a year earlier when he said that:

> . . . it is important to indicate that the problem of teachers for disadvantaged youth has arisen because of the inability of the university community (a) to deal with the problem of poverty and racism in American life; (b) to examine issues related to the systematic preparation of teachers in relationships to teaching disadvantaged youth, and, for that matter, all youth; and (c) to systematically examine the context of teacher dropouts and those teachers who remain in the system as career individuals.

Seemingly, the problem of providing vocational training for the disadvantaged has been forced upon educators suddenly, when it has actually been a rather steady growth that was not planned. It might not have mattered had our cities gone through a normal growth cycle, but it did not happen this way. The war spawned a massive migration from rural to urban areas. Urban growth continued with the knowledge explosion in science and technology.

Robert C. Weaver (12:62), president of a business school in New York City, stated that the historic role of the city has deteriorated badly. Its humanizing influence has faltered, and the urban cores are increasingly insulated from the larger society.

Many people would agree with Governor Robert E. McNair (12:96) of South Carolina, when he said that we should attempt to take education into the community and to the individual, rather than simply making it available to those who might care to partake of it. He emphasized that it is our challenge to educate the disadvantaged without slowing down the wheels of progress, and to continue to strive for excellence, but not at the expense of those persons who most need education.

Summary

Institutions of public education have provided training in agricultural education since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. This legislation has been extended by subsequent acts, providing for training programs in vocational education for off-farm occupations.

Economic, social and technological changes in recent years have focused on the specialization of agricultural production and the identification of many off-farm occupations in the vast agricultural industry. An abundance of research has been centered around determining the training needs required for entry into these off-farm occupations.

The literature related to curriculum development in agricultural education suggests that training for technical positions in agricultural industry should include the teaching of specific knowledge and skills. Courses of instruction should include specialization areas that have been identified in a particular community. In addition, the training program should be supported by courses in business, mathematics and communication. Pre-service occupational experiences in the laboratory should be carefully planned, as well as supervised cooperative occupational experiences with business and industry.

Colleges and universities are continually confronted with the problem of knowing what to teach. Since the needs of industry are the very foundation for vocational education programs, it is imperative that the needs of the agricultural industry be accurately assessed and met.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Introduction

In a world where the only thing constant is change, innovation has become a practical necessity. Nowhere has there been a greater need for innovation than in teacher education in agriculture. Scarborough (35:123) quoted a recognized educational leader late in 1967 when he said that "Agricultural education will disappear from our public schools in 10 years if we cannot produce the teachers needed."

After 50 years of vocational agriculture under provisions of the National Vocational Education Act, it should be clear to all that the job of the teacher of vocational agriculture is different today from that envisioned in the early 1900's, even in the one-teacher department. Recognition of this has been widespread, and many new and challenging programs have been undertaken at the high school and post high school levels. Likewise, according to Thompson and Rudd (39:128), many colleges are now sufficiently flexible in the undergraduate preparation of agricultural teachers so that graduates are capable of directing the new programs. While it is true that some realignment of curricula has occurred in many teacher preparation departments throughout the country, most teacher educators in agricultural education would hasten to agree that today's pre-service programs fall far short of job expectations faced by graduates. Change is ever present, making continuous adjustment a necessity.

This study was an attempt to determine concepts of five professional education groups toward the pre-service curriculum in agricultural education. It is hoped that this information will aid in the identification and solution to some of the problems confronting teacher educators in agriculture today.

The following pages of this chapter are presented to analyze and explain the evaluation of the role items and role activities by the five professional groups: The teacher educators; teachers of agriculture; supervisors; high school principals; and superintendents of public schools. Responses to 11 role items and 115 role activities, considered to be a possible function of pre-service teacher education in agriculture, were asked of 450 individuals selected to participate in the study. Of these, 340 responded for a 75.6 per cent return.

As a means for collecting data in determining "Emerging Concepts of Teacher Education in Agriculture," the five professional groups were asked to respond to the 115 role activities listed under the 11 role items. The items and activities were selected by the writer as conceived functions of teacher education in agriculture after deliberate consultation with associates, review of literature, and suggestions of a validating committee. The 11 role items are as follows: (1) Selection and Recruitment of Candidates, (2) General Education, (3) Technical Agriculture, (4) Professional Education, (5) Program Flexibility, (6) Student Teaching and Professional Internship, (7) Job Placement, (8) Organizations, (9) State Programs and Certification, (10) Cooperating Personnel and Agencies, and (11) Assessment of First Year Teaching.

For reference to mean scores for the five professional education groups in all tables, the following scale was used in determining the importance of each activity as perceived by the participants:

Undecided	No Value	Little Importance	Important	Very Important
0	2	3	4	5

For purposes of interpretation, true numbers were assigned in the following manner:

Very Important . . . . . 4.51 - 5.00

Important . . . . . 3.51 - 4.50

Little Importance . . . . . 2.51 - 3.50

No Value . . . . . 2.00 - 2.50

I. SELECTION AND RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES

The responses of the five professional groups with reference to Selection and Recruitment of Candidates are analyzed in Table I.

Data for this role item reveal an average mean response of 3.93 -- Important -- from the five groups. Of the fifteen activities listed under this role item, all received an average mean response of 3.26 or higher from each group. The lowest rating was given "Require experience in high school vocational agriculture for entry into agricultural education curriculum" -- Little Importance -- while the highest rating of 4.47 -- Important -- was given for "Develop positive working relationship with guidance counselors, teachers in elementary and junior high schools and agricultural business personnel."

TABLE I

MEAN RESPONSES OF FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF SELECTION AND RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES FOR THE PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Role Activity	Mean Responses TE	VAT	SPV	FR	SPT	F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
1. Conduct recruitment program in high schools and community colleges within limitations of state and institution regulations	4.41	4.14	4.27	3.76	3.75	7.73*	4.07
2. Identify student with agricultural education curriculum at freshman academic level	3.88	3.95	3.97	3.84	3.54	2.29	3.84
3. Require practical agricultural experience for entry into agricultural education curriculum	3.80	4.07	3.93	3.83	3.69	1.63	3.86
4. Require farm experience for entry into agricultural education curriculum	3.16	3.64	3.36	3.68	3.45	3.49*	3.46
5. Require experience in high school vocational agriculture for entry into agricultural education curriculum	2.86	3.43	3.25	3.40	3.36	3.97*	3.26
6. Require grade or quality point average for entry into advanced agricultural education curriculum	3.93	3.57	3.49	3.81	3.67	3.48*	3.69
7. Require aptitude and/or achievement test scores for entry into agricultural education curriculum	2.88	3.24	3.33	3.54	3.50	5.05*	3.30

(Continued)

TABLE I (Continued)

Role Activity	Mean Responses TE	VAT	SFV	FR	SPT	F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
8. Require conformity to general appearance and personal habits for entry into agricultural education curriculum	3.56	3.86	3.79	3.79	3.60	1.16	3.72
9. Provide pre-service training for qualified individuals of both sexes	4.57	4.03	3.95	3.86	3.64	7.76*	4.01
10. Counsel individual with disability that would prevent normal performance of duties as a vocational agriculture teacher	4.55	4.16	4.18	4.16	4.20	2.23	4.25
11. Provide orientation to program by appropriate staff member for entry into agricultural education curriculum	4.55	4.13	4.29	4.24	4.19	2.64*	4.28
12. Furnish occupational information such as need for graduates, opportunity for advancement, requirements for entry and certification to high school graduates and community and junior college students	4.52	4.47	4.43	4.45	4.44	0.16	4.46
13. Develop positive working relationship with guidance counselors, teachers in elementary and junior high schools and agricultural business personnel	4.39	4.53	4.51	4.56	4.37	0.84	4.47

(Continued)

TABLE I (Continued)

Role Activity	Mean Responses TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT	F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
14. Undertake studies to identify potentially outstanding prospects for the teacher training program	3.95	4.11	3.83	4.17	4.30	3.46*	4.07
15. Provide grants or scholarships to trainees who are deserving	4.02	4.20	4.06	4.43	4.28	2.48*	4.20
ROLE MEAN	3.94	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.87		3.93

NOTE: TE = Teacher Educators; VAT = Vocational Agricultural Teachers; SPV = Supervisors; PR = Principals; SPT = Superintendents

* = Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The average mean of the five groups of participants indicate that they are in accord, with a range of 3.87 -- Superintendents -- to 3.97 -- Vocational Agricultural Teachers. Even so, the data in Table I reveal that significant differences existed among their responses to nine of the fifteen activities.

These significant differences are noted in activities (1) Conduct recruitment program in high schools and community colleges . . ., (4) Require farm experience for entry into agricultural education curriculum, (5) Require experience in high school vocational agriculture . . ., (6) Require grade or quality point average for entry into advanced curriculum, (7) Require aptitude and/or achievement test scores for entry . . ., (9) Provide pre-service training for both sexes, (11) Provide orientation to program for entry . . ., (14) Undertake studies to identify potentially outstanding prospects . . ., and (15) Provide grants or scholarships to trainees who are deserving. The ratings given the other six activities showed no significant differences. This indicated that these, along with the over-all rating given the first role item, were considered "Important" to the five professional groups.

When the four comparisons were made, as revealed by data in Table II, it was shown that the teacher educators differed significantly in their responses to eight of the nine activities as compared to the responses of the other four groups. Activity (14) Undertake studies to identify potentially outstanding prospects . . . was the only activity indicating agreement between the teacher educators and the remaining groups.

TABLE II

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO ROLE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SELECTION AND RECRUITMENT OF CANDIDATES WHICH SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One[a]	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
1. Conduct recruitment program in high schools and community colleges within limitations of state and institution regulations	4.95*	1.64	1.86	3.46*
4. Require farm experience for entry into agricultural education curriculum	3.69*	1.04	1.86	0.51
5. Require experience in high school vocational agriculture for entry into agricultural education curriculum	5.60*	0.66	0.69	0.69
6. Require grade or quality point average for entry into advanced agricultural education curriculum	3.20*	0.63	1.96*	1.21
7. Require aptitude and/or achievement test scores for entry into agricultural education curriculum	6.26*	1.51	0.97	1.10
9. Provide pre-service training for qualified individuals of both sexes	8.45*	1.62	0.45	1.74
11. Provide orientation to program by appropriate staff member for entry into agricultural education curriculum	3.93*	0.86	0.03	0.76

(Continued)

TABLE II (Continued)

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One[a]	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
14. Undertake studies to identify potentially outstanding prospects for the teacher training program	1.47	0.06	2.43*	2.02*
15. Provide grants or scholarships to trainees who are deserving	2.27*	0.39	2.37*	1.37

NOTE: * Significant at the .05 level of confidence

[a] Description of comparison on page 9

Comparison Two, which excludes the teacher educators, showed that the vocational agricultural teachers did not differ significantly when compared to the responses of the three remaining groups. It is interesting to note that the teachers of agriculture gave this role item a higher mean response than any of the other groups. This may be an indication that the teacher is aware of the importance of recruitment and selection in helping guide the destiny of his students.

The third comparison equates the principal's responses with those of the supervisors and superintendents. Significant differences at the .05 level were noted in activities (6) Require grade or quality point average for entry . . ., (14) Undertake studies to identify potentially outstanding prospects . . . and (15) Provide grants or scholarships to trainees . . .

Comparison Four revealed that the supervisors and superintendents responded differently to two activities. These were: (1) Conduct recruitment program in high schools and community colleges . . . and (14) Undertake studies to identify potentially outstanding prospects. . .

It should be pointed out that three of the activities in this role item received a considerably lower rating than the other twelve. Activities four, five and seven had an average mean response of 3.34 -- Little Importance -- while the remaining twelve activities averaged 4.07 -- Important. The first two, requiring farm experience and high school vocational agriculture for entry into the curriculum, were emphasized more prior to the 1960's. The latter, requiring aptitude and/or achievement test scores for entry, received a 2.88 -- Little

Importance -- rating from the teacher educators and was rated highest by the principals with a 3.54 -- Important.

A summary of Selection and Recruitment of Candidates revealed that this role item had a rank order of eighth of the eleven items selected for this study. The average mean response for the item was 3.93 -- Important. The teachers of vocational agriculture gave the highest average response with 3.97. They were followed by the principals 3.96, teacher educators 3.94, supervisors 3.91, and superintendents 3.87.

The reader should be reminded that the comments of the participants were gathered from the survey instrument. They are categorized in the order of the activities and by groups and may be found in the appendix of this study.

11. GENERAL EDUCATION

The pre-service training curriculum in agricultural education has traditionally been divided into three major areas -- general education, technical agriculture and professional education. These continue to comprise the major divisions, with new innovations and realignments becoming a part of the most appropriate one. Definitions of these terms may be found in Chapter I of this study.

General education activities received an average role item response of 3.59 -- Important -- from the five professional education groups. This may be an indication that individuals close to the agricultural education program are reluctant to endorse the idea that the pre-service training program is outdated and in need of change in some areas.

Table III revealed that the range of the responses was rather narrow, with the supervisors reflecting the lowest role mean -- 3.51, and the superintendents the highest -- 3.70. There were, however, significant differences found between the five groups on six of the eight activities. Number (18) Remove the requirement of health and physical education and/or military science, received the lowest rating of 2.81 -- Little Importance -- and number (17) Provide list of alternative courses in the areas of communication, social science and humanities, received the highest of 4.01 -- Important. All groups were in agreement on these, so no further testing was needed.

As shown in Table IV -- Comparison One -- the teacher educators responses were significantly different from those of their counterparts on four of the six activities. These were: (16) Require the same general education courses for all students preparing to teach, (19) Require pre-service preparation in communications other than English and literature, (20) Require demonstration of competency in general education . . ., and (23) Require English proficiency test. Of particular interest were the ratings of 3.02, which was considerably below the activity mean response, and 4.18 -- Important -- that were given activities sixteen and nineteen, respectively, by the teacher educators.

In Comparison Two, as was the case in the previous role item, the data revealed that the vocational agricultural teachers were in agreement with the remaining three groups, teacher educators excluded. No significant differences were noted at the .05 level of confidence.

TABLE III

MEAN RESPONSES OF FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF GENERAL EDUCATION TO THE PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Role Activity	Mean Responses					F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
	TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT		
16. Require the same general education courses for all students preparing to teach	3.02	3.14	3.15	3.55	3.50	3.07*	3.27
17. Provide list of alternative courses from which agricultural education students could choose in the areas of communication, social science and humanities	4.14	4.10	3.96	3.88	3.98	1.01	4.01
18. Remove the requirement of health and physical education and/or military science	2.95	2.87	2.83	2.71	2.70	0.52	2.81
19. Require pre-service preparation in communications other than English composition and literature	4.18	3.71	3.91	3.63	3.67	3.53*	3.82
20. Require prospective teachers to demonstrate competency in the area of general education preparation	3.60	3.77	3.68	4.12	3.98	3.22*	3.83
21. Provide pre-service training in general economics	3.89	3.59	3.51	3.81	3.93	3.93*	3.75
22. Provide training in rural sociology	3.86	3.70	3.58	3.93	4.12	4.59*	3.84
23. Require English proficiency test	3.23	3.26	3.43	3.44	3.74	2.80*	3.42
ROLE MEAN	3.61	3.52	3.51	3.63	3.70		3.59

TABLE IV

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO ROLE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO GENERAL EDUCATION WHICH SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
16. Require the same general education courses for all students preparing to teach	2.67*	1.63	1.56	1.81
19. Require pre-service preparation in communications other than English composition and literature	4.39*	0.16	1.22	1.40
20. Require prospective teachers to demonstrate competency in the area of general education preparation	2.58*	1.06	2.59*	1.71
21. Provide pre-service training in general economics	1.72	1.20	0.82	2.74*
22. Provide training in rural sociology	0.34	1.30	0.70	3.18*
23. Require English proficiency test	2.11*	1.77	1.14	1.83

When the principals were compared with the combined responses of the supervisors and superintendents, a significant difference was found in only one of the six activities. This was activity 20 requiring a demonstration of competency in general education. Both the supervisors and superintendents had less affinity for the activity than did the principals.

In Comparison Four, the superintendents had a higher regard for activities 22 and 23 than did the supervisors. These dealt with providing training in rural sociology, and requiring an English proficiency test. Responses of the two groups differed significantly, with the superintendents giving a higher rating to both.

A summary of General Education revealed that this role item attained a rank order of eleventh of the 11 items selected for this study. The average mean response given this item by the five professional groups was 3.59 -- Important. The superintendents gave the highest average response with 3.70. They were followed by the principals 3.63, teacher trainers 3.61, teachers of vocational agriculture 3.52, and supervisors, 3.51.

III. TECHNICAL AGRICULTURE

The fifteen activities listed under this role item received an over-all mean response of 4.20 -- Important. There was almost complete accord among the five professional education groups, as significant differences were noted in only two activities. These were: (26) Develop ability to understand importance of training in careers at the elementary and junior high levels and (33) Provide course offerings in agri-business

taught by agricultural education faculty. All of the fifteen activities received a rating of 3.51 -- Important -- or higher, and each of the five groups responded with a range of 4.14 (Principals) to 4.27 (Teacher Educators). The activity receiving the highest response was number 29 -- preparing students in the field of agri-business (4.60 -- Very Important). The lowest rating was given activity 25 -- emphasizing pre-service training geared to production agriculture (3.59). The teacher educators indicated their awareness of the importance of agri-business training by rating that activity 4.73 -- Very Important. (Table V)

The only differences revealed in the four comparisons were between the teacher educators and the average of the other four groups of participants. The two activities involved were (26) understanding importance of training in career information at elementary and junior high levels and (33) provide course offerings in agri-business taught by agricultural education faculty. The teacher educators favored the former with the highest rating of 4.31 -- Important -- and gave a much lower rating of 3.64 -- Important -- to the latter.(Table VI)

A summary of Technical Agriculture revealed that this role item ranked second in importance of the 11 items used in the study. The average mean response given by the five groups for Technical Agriculture was 4.20 -- Important. The teacher educators held the highest regard for it with an average rating of 4.27, followed by the teachers 4.21, supervisors 4.20, superintendents 4.16, and principals 4.14.

TABLE V

MEAN RESPONSES OF FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL AGRICULTURE TO THE PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Role Activity	Mean Responses					F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
	TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT		
24. Develop responsibility for the preparation of high school students in areas not traditionally recognized as agriculture	4.30	4.06	3.99	4.05	3.80	1.66	4.04
25. Emphasize pre-service training geared to production agriculture	3.65	3.75	3.59	3.63	3.33	1.86	3.59
26. Develop ability to understand importance of training in career information and choice at elementary and junior high levels	4.31	3.98	4.04	3.88	3.74	2.98*	3.99
27. Combine and intensify related courses to allow for additional courses in the curriculum	4.23	4.07	4.13	4.02	3.95	0.93	4.08
28. Update teacher preparation in training for farming to more adequately meet current demands	4.31	4.38	4.24	4.36	4.43	0.60	4.34
29. Prepare students in the field of agri-business--its nature, scope, importance and relationship to the general economy	4.73	4.61	4.54	4.55	4.56	1.01	4.60
30. Develop ability to identify occupational opportunities that exist in the agri-business field	4.57	4.65	4.57	4.40	4.56	1.22	4.55

(Continued)

TABLE V (Continued)

Role Activity	Mean Responses TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT	F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
31. Modify existing curricula offerings to include pre-service agri-business training	4.55	4.33	4.36	4.33	4.31	0.85	4.38
32. Develop cooperative training in agri-business involving the institution and business	4.47	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.38	0.49	4.36
33. Provide course offerings in agri-business taught by agricultural education faculty	3.64	4.16	4.06	4.00	4.35	4.13*	4.04
34. Provide course offerings in agri-business taught by agricultural economics faculty	3.95	3.77	3.88	3.93	4.02	0.84	3.91
35. Develop new teaching materials for use in agri-business training	4.45	4.60	4.42	4.32	4.44	1.75	4.45
36. Provide job-analysis training related to principles and procedures in agri-business	4.30	4.20	4.26	4.15	4.26	0.31	4.23
37. Provide agri-business internship in specialization area or area of choice	4.25	4.05	4.14	4.00	4.14	0.67	4.12
38. Provide for resource personnel in off-farm agricultural occupations	4.33	4.30	4.37	4.21	4.16	0.78	4.27
ROLE MEAN	4.27	4.21	4.20	4.14	4.16		4.20

TABLE VI

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO ROLE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO TECHNICAL AGRICULTURE WHICH SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
26. Develop ability to understand importance of training in career information and choice at elementary and junior high schools	4.40*	0.62	0.13	1.77
33. Provide course offerings in agri-business taught by agricultural education faculty	4.16*	0.15	1.63	1.66

IV. PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Professional Education, which may be defined as that which has as its primary objective the assisting of students to become more proficient in teaching, but not including courses in general education and technical agriculture, is probably the most restricted of the three divisions of the pre-service curriculum. Some leading teacher educators in agriculture have suggested that here is an area needing reform by the addition of course work to implement the new and changing concepts that have emerged since the 1963 Vocational Education Act. The following discussion of the activities included in this study should defend this suggestion, and point up the importance that the five professional groups held for this area of the pre-service training program.

The average mean response of the five groups for the entire role item (Table VII) -- Professional Education -- was 4.06. This indicates that all groups responded with an average rating of "Important," as only one of the 24 activities received a rating of less than 3.51 -- Little Importance.

Distribution of the role mean for the five groups showed the teacher educators and principals above the average of 4.06, the superintendents near the average at 4.08, and the vocational agricultural teachers and supervisors below the average. The teacher educators rated this role item highest with 4.21 -- Important -- while the teachers of vocational agriculture rated it lowest with 3.92 -- Important. The range was again narrow, indicating general agreement among the groups as to the over-all importance. The activity receiving the highest average mean

TABLE VII

MEAN RESPONSES OF FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION TO THE PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Role	Activity	Mean Responses					F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
		TE	VAT	SPV	FR	SPT		
39.	Provide training experience in professional preparation at off-campus centers, under supervision of university staff	4.63	4.34	4.20	4.24	4.02	3.68*	4.29
40.	Place all vocational students in job related vocational courses	4.00	3.66	3.73	3.86	3.61	1.34	3.78
41.	Require job related occupational experiences or demonstrated competence of prospective teachers of vocational agriculture prior to certification	4.26	3.84	4.05	4.22	4.10	2.73*	4.09
42.	Provide training in sociology of education	3.66	3.26	3.40	3.69	3.76	4.42*	3.55
43.	Provide training in psychology of education	4.26	3.54	3.59	3.98	3.88	8.19*	3.85
44.	Provide training for preparation of teaching materials	4.48	4.47	4.36	4.33	4.38	0.67	4.40
45.	Provide training in philosophy of education	3.88	3.32	3.55	3.76	3.83	4.45*	3.67
46.	Provide training in history of education	3.26	2.92	3.16	3.23	3.12	1.80	3.14
47.	Provide training in methods of teaching	4.80	4.49	4.61	4.76	4.55	2.79*	4.64

(Continued)

TABLE VII (Continued)

Role	Activity	Mean Responses TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT	F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
48.	Provide training in principles and practices in general education	3.74	3.38	3.57	3.98	3.88	5.67*	3.71
49.	Promote constant modification of teaching materials and techniques	4.57	4.41	4.46	4.55	4.54	0.64	4.51
50.	Provide training for integration of curriculum content	4.51	4.12	4.20	4.24	4.26	2.27	4.27
51.	Provide training for cooperation with teachers of communications, salesmanship, human relations, science and others for a more coordinated teaching effort at the high school level	4.45	4.19	4.26	4.57	4.40	2.71*	4.37
52.	Develop skills in the function of research in today's agricultural field	3.72	3.77	3.61	4.05	4.21	5.30*	3.87
53.	Bring university and secondary school personnel together for more effective programs in teacher preparation	4.59	4.40	4.38	4.50	4.48	0.94	4.47
54.	Develop skills in procedures that are clinically and case-study oriented	3.95	3.51	3.52	3.85	3.95	4.44*	3.76
55.	Develop ability to conduct small group and individualized instruction	4.77	4.38	4.46	4.62	4.64	4.46*	4.57
56.	Introduce the concept of differentiated teaching roles	4.17	3.83	3.94	4.19	4.18	3.23*	4.06

(Continued)

TABLE VII (Continued)

Role	Activity	Mean Responses TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT	F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
57.	Provide training on classroom and non-classroom teaching behavior	4.41	4.16	4.15	4.31	4.10	1.51	4.23
58.	Provide training in vocational guidance principles	4.44	4.20	4.34	4.43	4.26	1.43	4.33
59.	Provide pre-service training in preparation for judging contests	3.39	3.66	3.56	3.69	3.88	2.10	3.64
60.	Train students for directing the occupational development process	4.48	3.80	4.10	4.00	3.95	6.79*	4.07
61.	Develop ability to provide adult and young farmer instruction	4.36	4.32	4.33	4.24	4.33	0.18	4.12
62.	Develop ability to aid in establishing boys in farming	4.25	3.99	4.12	3.92	3.68	2.78*	3.99
	ROLE MEAN	4.21	3.92	3.99	4.13	4.08		4.06

response from the five groups was number (47) Provide training in methods of teaching -- 4.64 -- Very Important and the one with the lowest rating was number (46) Provide training in history of education -- 3.14.

The four comparisons for activities of professional education to which significant differences were reflected revealed a difference between the responses of the teacher educators -- Comparison One -- and the average mean responses of the other four groups with respect to nine of the fourteen activities included in the comparisons. They were: (39) Provide training experience in professional preparation at off-campus centers . . ., (41) Require job related occupational experiences or demonstrated competence prior to certification, (43) Provide training in psychology of education, (45) Provide training in philosophy of education, (47) Provide training in methods of teaching, (54) Develop skills in procedures that are clinically and case-study oriented, (55) Develop ability to conduct small group and individualized instruction, (60) Train students for directing the occupational development process, and (62) Develop ability to aid in establishing boys in farming. The results of these comparisons can be observed in Table VIII.

Comparison Two results may also be found in Table VIII, comparing the responses of the teachers of vocational agriculture with the combined responses of the remaining three groups -- teacher educators excluded. Significant differences were revealed in the following activities: (42) Provide training in sociology of education, (45) Provide training in philosophy of education, and (48) Provide training in principles and practices in general education.

TABLE VIII

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO ROLE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION WHICH SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
39. Provide training experience in professional preparation at off-campus centers, under supervision of university staff	4.49*	1.39	1.11	1.00
41. Require job-related occupational experiences or demonstrated competence of prospective teachers of vocational agriculture prior to certification	2.19*	1.86	1.21	0.30
42. Provide training in sociology of education	1.26	2.46*	0.93	2.08*
43. Provide training in psychology of education	5.25*	1.82	2.28*	1.75
45. Provide training in philosophy of education	2.53*	2.38*	0.48	1.57
47. Provide training in methods of teaching	2.98*	1.27	2.32*	0.46
48. Provide training in principles and practices in general education	0.40	3.32*	2.15*	1.74
51. Provide training for cooperation with teachers of communication, salesmanship, human relations, science and others for a more coordinated teaching effort at the high school level	1.15	1.68	2.21*	0.97

(Continued)

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
52. Develop skills in the function of research in today's agricultural field	1.94	1.32	1.12	3.44*
54. Develop skills in precedures that are clinically and case-study oriented	2.26*	1.70	0.92	2.55*
55. Develop ability to conduct small group and individualized instruction	3.97*	1.67	0.84	1.57
56. Introduce the concept of differentiated teaching roles	1.85	1.82	1.25	1.64
60. Train students for directing the occupational development process	6.19*	1.60	0.25	0.93
62. Develop ability to aid in establishing boys in farming	3.22*	0.52	0.21	2.46*

Principals versus supervisors and superintendents indicated significant differences at the .05 level for activities 43, 47, 48 and 51, cooperative training within the school for a more coordinated teaching effort.

The fourth comparison showed that the supervisors and superintendents held significantly different views with regard to four of the fourteen activities. As given in Table VIII, these included (42) Training in sociology of education, (52) Develop skills in procedures that are clinically and case-study oriented, and (62) Develop ability to aid in establishing boys in farming.

Although there were differences among the five groups with respect to the professional education area of the curriculum, it should be mentioned that Table VIII reveals that it received a role mean response of "Important."

A summary of Professional Education indicates a rank order of fifth of the 11 role items. The average response of the five professional groups for this item was 4.06 -- Important. The teacher trainers gave the highest average response with a 4.21. They were followed by the principals 4.13, superintendents 4.08, supervisors 3.99, and the teachers of vocational agriculture 3.92.

V. PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY

Flexibility is the term that has been used and accepted by teacher educators in agriculture as suitable to represent the recent attempts to realign or restructure traditional programs so that new ideas, materials

and courses could be incorporated into them. It is highly probable that all 13 activities listed under this role item are not a part of the pre-service training in a large number of institutions today, yet Table IX reveals that the average role mean response for all them is 4.09 -- Important. The teacher educators assigned the greatest value to this role item with 4.19, while 4.14, 4.10, 4.05, and 3.96 were given by the principals, supervisors, teachers of agriculture, and superintendents, respectively. The activity receiving the highest average response -- 4.56 -- Very Important -- from the five groups was number (64) Develop ability to provide training to meet the needs of a wide variety of students in a class. Number (65) Provide training for educational personnel such as cooperative extension workers and workers on foreign assignments received the lowest rating of 3.62 -- approaching "Little Importance."

Significant differences among the groups existed for only three activities. Table X reveals these to be numbers (66) Provide training in FFA sponsored contests, (67) Provide sufficient free electives to allow for more specialization and (74) Support the premise that vocational education is the logical and proper vehicle to move the disadvantaged into the mainstream of life. In Comparison One, the teacher educators differed from the other groups with respect to the first two, giving the lowest response -- 3.59 -- to number 66 and the highest -- 4.59 -- to number 67.

Comparisons Three and Four indicated that the groups differed in regard to activity 74, with the superintendents lower regard of 3.69 being the source of the difference in both comparisons.

TABLE IX

MEAN RESPONSES OF FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY TO THE PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Role Activity	Mean Responses					F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
	TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT		
63. Emphasize importance of training workers at all levels of competence	4.33	4.17	4.32	4.43	4.09	1.75	4.27
64. Develop ability of prospective teachers to provide curriculum to meet the needs of a wide variety of students in a class	4.77	4.45	4.52	4.60	4.44	2.09	4.56
65. Provide training for educational personnel such as cooperative extension workers and workers on foreign assignments	3.86	3.62	3.47	3.54	3.60	1.40	3.62
66. Provide training in FFA sponsored contests	3.58	4.74	3.96	4.10	4.07	3.69*	3.97
67. Provide sufficient free elective credits to allow for more specialized training in the pre-service program for those desiring it	4.59	4.24	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.20*	4.23
68. Provide training for prospective teachers in adult classes for persons engaged in farming and agricultural business to help them adjust to changing technology, new products, new methods and current needs of people	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.28	0.43	4.34

(Continued)

TABLE IX (Continued)

Role Activity	Mean Responses TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT	F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
69. Provide additional course work at the pre-service level for preparing prospective teachers to work with disadvantaged students	4.19	3.93	4.03	4.15	3.88	1.27	4.04
70. Develop ability to recognize peculiar problems of students of different ethnic and social groups	4.29	4.00	4.17	4.30	4.09	1.65	4.17
71. Conduct special invitational institutes, workshops and conferences involving opinion leaders among vocational agricultural teachers	3.98	3.98	4.00	4.02	3.95	0.05	3.99
72. Provide in-school student teaching experiences in disadvantaged areas	4.00	3.91	4.00	3.98	3.68	1.47	3.91
73. Develop internships which will provide appropriate experiences for teaching the disadvantaged	4.02	3.89	3.92	4.03	3.85	0.45	3.94
74. Support the premise that vocational education is the logical and proper vehicle to move disadvantaged into the mainstream of life	4.16	4.03	4.19	4.21	3.69	2.88*	4.06
75. Require observation of in-service setting prior to and following student teaching	4.20	4.02	4.09	4.10	3.88	0.80	4.06
ROLE MEAN	4.19	4.05	4.10	4.14	3.96		4.09

TABLE X

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO ROLE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY WHICH SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
66. Provide training in FFA sponsored contests	5.09*	0.65	0.66	0.65
67. Provide sufficient free elective credits to allow for more specialized training in the pre-service program for those desiring it	5.25*	0.94	0.56	1.70
74. Support the premise that vocational education is the logical and proper vehicle to move disadvantaged into the mainstream of life	1.19	0.02	1.98*	3.13*

To summarize the role item Program Flexibility, it was noted that it received a rank order of three of the eleven selected for this study. An average role item mean of 4.09 -- Important -- was given by the five groups of particpants. Highest in their average evaluation were the teacher educators with 4.19. The remaining groups responded in the following manner: Principals 4.14, supervisors 4.10, teachers 4.05, and superintendents 3.96.

VI. STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL INTERNSHIP

Much has been written and discussed concerning the student teaching and professional internship phase of pre-service training in agricultural education. There can be little doubt that the traditional high school student teaching fails to meet the needs of many graduates in agricultural education today. Some states have revised their standards regarding student teaching, but the major overhaul that has been proposed as a profound need will require extended time to implement. The majority of the departments training teachers of vocational agriculture are not presently equipped from the standpoint of staff and facilities to adequately handle the diverse needs of their students.

In his book, A Design for Teacher Education, Masoner (8) refers to this need as a practice that should culminate in a true internship experience. Others have seen the need as two-fold -- the student teaching experience plus occupational experience in an area of choice. Clark (48) suggests that ". . . criteria be developed by the staff in agricultural education to measure the competence of students in terms of occupational experience objectives. Students who meet minimum standards may waive

the requirement, or may seek to improve their abilities through additional experience." The literature revealed that many innovative plans concerning student teaching and professional internship are being planned and initiated throughout the country.

Table XI clearly indicates the importance that the participants in this study place on this phase of the pre-service training program. The average role mean response of the five professional groups was 4.29 -- Important -- the highest role mean assigned to the 11 role items included in this study. All groups rated the eight activities "Important" and in the following order: teacher educators 4.46, principals 4.37, supervisors 4.27, vocational agricultural teachers 4.23 and superintendents 4.10.

The activity receiving the highest average mean response was number (77) Provide student teaching experiences for all agricultural majors to be conducted in public high schools. The rating of 4.62 -- Very Important -- was the second highest given to the 115 activities used in the study.

In addition to activity 77, significant differences among the groups were revealed in activities (81) Provide for student seminars, (82) Provide training in "team" and "cooperative" teaching techniques and (83) Provide experience with continuing education programs. Table XII shows that the teacher educators' responses were different from those of the other groups with respect to the latter three -- Comparison One. Comparison Three, equating the ratings of the principals with those of the supervisors and superintendents, revealed that differences existed

TABLE XI

MEAN RESPONSES OF FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL INTERNSHIP TO THE PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Role Activity	Mean Responses					F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
	TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT		
76. Conduct pre-student teaching training sessions individually and collectively	4.43	4.18	4.33	4.33	4.15	1.33	4.28
77. Provide student teaching experiences for all agricultural education majors to be conducted in public high schools	4.73	4.60	4.78	4.57	4.40	3.50*	4.62
78. Place students with definite occupational objectives in areas that will complement their objectives	4.67	4.38	4.45	4.40	4.35	1.53	4.45
79. Provide cooperative off-campus student teaching centers involving educational institutions, business and industry supervisory personnel	4.46	4.09	4.24	4.26	4.12	1.93	4.23
80. Provide substantial remuneration for efforts of critic or supervising teachers	4.11	4.09	3.99	4.22	3.78	1.65	4.04
81. Provide for student teaching seminars	4.44	4.33	4.13	4.45	4.00	3.82*	4.27
82. Provide training in "team" and "cooperative" teaching techniques	4.30	4.07	4.11	4.38	3.88	2.83*	4.15
83. Provide experience with continuing education programs	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.31	4.12	3.44*	4.24
ROLE MEAN	4.46	4.23	4.27	4.37	4.10		4.29

TABLE XII

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO ROLE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL INTERNSHIP WHICH SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
77. Provide student teaching experiences for all agricultural education majors to be conducted in public high schools	1.63	0.18	0.17	3.37*
81. Provide for student teaching seminars	2.48*	1.06	3.70*	0.83
82. Provide training in "team" and "cooperative" teaching techniques	2.03*	0.37	3.61*	1.39
83. Provide experience with continuing education programs	4.79*	0.72	1.76	0.12

in activities (81) Provide for student teaching seminars and (82) Provide training in "team" and "cooperative" teaching techniques. The principals' evaluations were greater than their counterparts in both cases, pointing up the source of the differences. When the supervisors and superintendents were compared, the extremely high rating -- 4.78 -- given activity number 77 by the supervisors resulted in a significant difference for that activity. It is especially interesting that the supervisors and teacher educators gave activity (77) Provide student teaching experiences for all agricultural education majors to be conducted in public high schools -- a combined average of 4.76. This may be an indication that many individuals that exert primary influence on the program continue to be reluctant to depart from the traditional student teaching experience.

Student Teaching and Professional Internships ranked first in order of importance by the five groups of educators. It drew an average role mean of 4.29 -- highest of the 11 used in the study. The teacher educators were highest in their ranking with an average of 4.46 -- near the "Very Important" level. Other rankings were the principals 4.37, supervisors 4.27, vocational agriculture teachers 4.23, and the superintendents 4.10.

VII. JOB PLACEMENT

The five professional education groups participating in this study were asked to evaluate "Job Placement" according to their concept of the responsibility of the pre-service program for that item. The

results of their responses, as shown in Table XIII, reveal that all role activities except (84) Rely on institution placement service, and (90) Encourage use of employment agency contracts -- received a rating of 4.15 or better indicating job placement of graduates as "Important" to the pre-service program. Activities 84 and 90 drew ratings of 3.54 and 2.82 respectively, indicating considerably less importance when compared to the 4.37 average rating assigned to the other five activities. The average role mean was 4.03 -- Important -- with a group range demonstrating close agreement.

Providing help in placement of graduates by staff members in agricultural education received the highest average mean response -- 4.48. Teacher educators undoubtedly assume an unusual degree of responsibility here, and obviously do a commendable job if the responses of the other four groups to this activity are any indication. The teachers of vocational agriculture were profound in their response of 4.63 -- Very Important -- to activity (88) Provide periodic listing of teaching vacancies through teachers, principals and superintendents. This could indicate that yet more time and energy may be needed in job placement. The writer believes this to be true, but also sees the responsibility as one that must be shared by the universities, public schools and possibly the state departments of education.

Significant differences between groups were noted in only two of the seven activities. These were (88) Provide periodic listing of teaching vacancies . . ., and (90) Encourage use of employment agency contracts. The latter was rated lowest of the activities listed under job placement at 2.82 -- Little Importance.

TABLE XIII

MEAN RESPONSES OF FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF JOB PLACEMENT TO THE PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Role Activity	Mean Responses					F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
	TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT		
84. Rely on institution placement service	3.53	3.58	3.46	3.61	3.54	0.31	3.54
85. Provide training on expected and acceptable employment procedures and practices	4.41	4.09	4.17	4.17	3.93	2.36	4.15
86. Encourage prospective graduates to develop personal data sheet for employment purposes	4.47	4.41	4.45	4.48	4.37	0.19	4.44
87. Provide help in placement of graduates by staff members in agricultural education	4.70	4.47	4.51	4.40	4.31	2.32	4.48
88. Provide periodic listing of teaching vacancies through teachers, principals and superintendents	4.20	4.63	4.29	4.52	4.31	4.47*	4.39
89. Provide prospective employers with the aspects of agriculture the graduate is most qualified to teach	4.33	4.30	4.46	4.38	4.45	0.87	4.38
90. Encourage use of employment agency contracts	2.56	2.97	2.80	3.11	2.66	2.53*	2.82
ROLE MEAN	4.03	4.06	4.02	4.10	3.94		4.03

Data in Table XIV reveal the results of four comparisons made for the seven role activities to which the responses to job placement by the five professional groups were shown to differ significantly. Comparison One reveals that the teacher educators placed less emphasis on activities 88 and 90, when compared to the average of the remaining groups of participants. As mentioned previously, the vocational agricultural teachers had a high regard for activity (88) Provide periodic listing of teaching vacancies, and this was the source of the difference in Comparison Two. The principals also favored the two activities more than the supervisors and superintendents as is revealed in Comparison Three, where significant differences are shown for both activities in Table XIV. Comparison Four indicated that the supervisors and superintendents held similar views.

A summary of Job Placement shows that it was ranked sixth in order of importance by the participating groups. The average mean response given this item by all groups was 4.03 -- Important. The principals held the most favor for it with a rating of 4 10, followed by the teachers 4.06, teacher educators 4.03, supervisors 4.02, and the superintendents 3.94.

VIII. ORGANIZATIONS

The responses of the five professional groups to six activities pertaining to organizations and the pre-service curriculum were quite varied, even though the average role mean was 4.09 -- Important. As shown in Table XV, activity (96) Provide for use of professional organizations as "partners" in teacher education was the only one not revealing

TABLE XIV

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO ROLE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO JOB PLACEMENT WHICH SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
88. Provide periodic listing of teachers vacancies through teachers, principals and superintendents	2.17*	2.37*	2.30*	0.12
90. Encourage use of employment agency contracts	3.04*	0.67	2.37*	0.70

TABLE XV

MEAN RESPONSES OF FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF ORGANIZATIONS TO THE PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Role Activity	Mean Responses					F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
	TE	VAT	SEV	FR	SPT		
91. Provide training on importance of youth organizations and activities	4.57	4.46	4.51	4.19	4.24	3.15*	4.39
92. Maintain traditional future farmer organization	3.17	4.35	4.09	3.98	3.64	14.68*	3.85
93. Encourage movement toward modification of the FFA to a more comprehensive agricultural organization	4.57	3.82	3.95	4.38	4.00	5.15*	4.14
94. Promote increased participation in collegiate organizations and activities	4.18	3.99	3.74	3.83	3.56	4.29*	3.86
95. Provide information concerning the importance of professional organizations to workers in the field	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.12	3.86	3.96*	4.18
96. Provide for use of professional organizations as "partners" in teacher education	4.25	4.17	4.09	4.15	3.83	1.95	4.10
ROLE MEAN	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.11	3.86		4.09

significant differences among the groups, and even it approached significance at the .05 level of confidence. The activity receiving the highest average evaluation was (91) Provide training on importance of youth organizations and activities. It rated 4.39 -- Important -- as the teacher educators responded with 4.57 -- Very Important -- highest of the five professional groups.

The results of four comparisons for the five activities to which the group responses were significantly different toward organizations are given in Table XVI. Comparison One clearly indicates that the teacher educators differed from the remaining groups when the average responses were equated. Teacher educators rated four of the five activities higher than their counterparts. Number (92) Maintain traditional future farmer organization was given a 3.17 -- Little Importance -- rating by the teacher educators, while the combined average of the four other groups was 4.02 -- Important. This represented the greatest departure of the agricultural education participants from the other groups. It was surprising to the writer to notice the highly significant differences between the teachers of vocational agriculture and the teacher educators in regard to this activity, indicating that the teacher may be content with the present FFA organization. This activity was the only source of significant difference in Comparison Two, as the vocational agricultural teachers' high rating of 4.35 was not reflected in the combined replies of the supervisors, principals and supervisors.

Comparison Three, also given in Table XVI, pictured the principals as having a much higher regard for activity (93) Encourage movement

TABLE XVI

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO ROLE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO ORGANIZATIONS WHICH SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
91. Provide training on importance of youth organization and activities	2.88*	1.21	1.79	2.05*
92. Maintain traditional future farmer organizations	7.44*	2.85*	0.79	2.37*
93. Encourage movement toward modification of the FFA to a more comprehensive agricultural organization	5.00*	1.41	2.84*	0.21
94. Promote increased participation in collegiate organizations and activities	4.62*	1.92	1.41	1.04
95. Provide information concerning the importance of professional organizations to workers in the field	3.83*	1.52	0.70	2.55*

toward modification of the FFA to a more comprehensive agricultural organization, when compared to the supervisors and superintendents. Three activities, numbers (91) Provide training on importance of youth organizations and activities, (92) Maintain traditional future farmer organization, and (95) Provide information concerning the importance of professional organizations to workers in the field, showed differences that were significant in Comparison Four. The supervisors rated all three higher than did the superintendents.

Perhaps worthy of second mention is the apparent low regard shown this role item by the public school superintendents. Concern may be warranted, especially in areas where the superintendents are not in agreement with the high school principals.

In summarizing Organizations, it was noted that the item was ranked fourth by the five groups. The average role mean was 4.09 -- Important. Once again the teacher educators were highest in their evaluation with an average response of 4.20. They were followed by the teachers of agriculture 4.18, principals 4.11, supervisors 4.10, and superintendents 3.86.

IX. STATE PROGRAMS AND CERTIFICATION

The 11 activities comprising the role item concerning state programs and certification received an over-all rating of 3.88 -- Important -- from the five professional groups. As shown in Table XVII, the superintendents evaluation for the role was lower than the other groups, although none of the five groups responded with a rating of 4.00 or higher. The activity receiving the highest rating (104) encouraged

TABLE XVII

MEAN RESPONSES OF FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF STATE PROGRAMS AND CERTIFICATION TO THE PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Role Activity	Mean Responses					F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
	TE	VAT	SPV	FR	SPT		
97. Continue traditional and current general pattern of certification to teach vocational agriculture under state laws	3.36	4.06	3.78	3.73	3.50	4.85*	3.69
98. Require prospective graduates to demonstrate competencies required for entry into the profession, rather than certification based on prescribed course credits	3.88	3.85	4.01	4.15	4.21	1.47	4.02
99. Consider certification of qualified persons in business and industry for teaching in specialized areas without traditional preparation as now required	3.85	3.49	3.88	3.95	3.72	2.23	3.78
100. Require satisfactory performance on national teacher examination for certification	2.39	2.65	2.57	2.72	2.71	1.08	2.61
101. Upgrade agricultural teachers with special or provisional certificates for eventual certification and professional growth	4.08	3.88	3.93	3.82	3.76	0.79	3.89

(Continued)

TABLE XVII (Continued)

Role Activity	Mean Responses TE	VAT	SPV	FR	SPT	F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
102. Provide in state programs for continuing funds for the kinds of training not provided by the institution for preparation of other teachers, such as non-credit in-service programs, internships for graduates and development of instructional materials	4.20	4.18	4.30	4.10	3.79	3.08*	4.11
103. Provide for annual review of budgets and activities by university and state staffs for modification in terms of current needs	4.23	3.84	3.99	4.00	3.89	1.39	3.99
104. Encourage increased supervisory contact with vocational agricultural teachers by area or district supervisor	4.42	4.31	4.38	4.10	3.83	4.47*	4.21
105. Provide itinerant teacher trainer to assist teachers on the job	4.50	4.20	4.20	4.00	3.78	4.31*	4.14
106. Provide teacher educator with specialty in technical subject matter to assist teachers on the job	4.02	4.29	4.14	4.17	3.80	2.34	4.08
107. Provide teacher educator with training and experience to assist local school personnel in planning the program in vocational agriculture	4.47	4.26	4.07	4.18	3.85	3.28*	4.17
ROLE MEAN	3.95	3.91	3.93	3.90	3.71		3.88

increased supervisory contact with teachers of vocational agriculture by the area or district supervisor. The average mean response for it was 4.21 -- Important. The activity concerned with requiring satisfactory performance on the national teacher examination for certification met with little favor among the participants, getting the low average mean response of 2.61 -- indicating a low regard for this activity.

Of the 11 role activities presented in Table XVII, five resulted in significant differences expressed by the participants in the study. These were (97) Continue traditional and current general pattern of certification . . ., (102) Provide for continuing funds for the kinds of training not provided by the institution for preparation of other teachers, such as in-service programs, internships , (104) Encourage increased supervisory contact with teachers of vocational agriculture by supervisors . ., (105) Provide itinerant teacher trainer to assist teachers on the job, and (107) Provide teacher educator to assist local schools in planning the program in vocational agriculture.

Comparison One, which is given in Table XVIII, revealed that the teacher educators' responses were significantly different with regard to all but one activity (102) when compared to the average of the other four groups. In each activity where this difference occurred, the teacher educators' responses were greater than any of the other four, thus pointing to the source of the differences. Comparison Two compared the agricultural teachers with the principals, supervisors and superintendents. The activity dealing with continuing the current general pattern of certification (97) was the lone activity showing a significant difference

TABLE XVIII

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO ROLE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO STATE PROGRAMS AND CERTIFICATION WHICH SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
97. Continue traditional and current general pattern of certification to teach vocational agriculture under state laws	3.24*	2.46*	0.59	1.32
102. Provide in state programs for continuing funds for the kinds of training not provided by the institution for preparation of other teachers, such as non-credit in-service programs, internships for graduates and development of instructional materials	0.96	0.70	0.52	3.32*
104. Encourage increased supervisory contact with vocational agricultural teachers by area or district supervisor	2.49*	1.42	0.08	3.42*
105. Provide itinerant teacher trainer to assist teachers on the job	4.61*	1.38	0.07	2.36*
107. Provide teacher educator with training and experience to assist local school personnel in planning the program in vocational agriculture	3.87*	1.53	1.64	1.13

in Comparison Two. This could indicate that the vocational agricultural teachers are satisfied with current certification standards, as their responses were higher than those of the other four professional groups.

The principals' evaluation of these five activities did not differ appreciably from that of the supervisors and superintendents in Comparison Three. Comparison Four, however, as revealed in Table XVIII, showed that the supervisors and superintendents were at odds that were significant at the .05 level for activities 102, 104 and 105. In all three of these activities, the supervisors held higher views as compared to those of the superintendents.

A summary of State Programs and Certification revealed a rank of ninth in order of importance as given by the participants in the study. The average mean response for this item was 3.88 -- Important. Highest in their average evaluation were the teacher educators with a 3.95, followed by the supervisors 3.93, teachers of agriculture 3.91, principals 3.90, and superintendents 3.71.

X. COOPERATING PERSONNEL AND AGENCIES

Teachers of vocational agriculture must necessarily become involved with people in other areas of the agricultural industry. For this reason, several activities concerning cooperating personnel and agencies were included in this study. These were: (108) Provide opportunity for pre-service professional staff to participate in research, (109) Provide individual pre-service training for students desiring training for work other than teaching, (110) Establish a cooperative program with agricultural extension and Federal agency personnel, and

(111) Develop ability to recognize the value of complementary relationships with agencies and personnel involved in or related to the agricultural complex.

The over-all role mean expressed by the five professional education groups was 3.78 -- Important. Number 111 was the only activity to warrant a rating of 4.00 or greater. The teacher educators considered these activities "Important," as they rated the role item 4.03. The remaining four groups showed less affinity for it with evaluations as follows: principals 3.77, supervisors 3.73, superintendents 3.73, and teachers of vocational agriculture 3.67. Activity (109) Provide training for work other than teaching received the lowest rating at 3.59, as shown in Table XIX.

It is understandable that the teacher educators would hold the importance of the research in different perspective than that of their counterparts. This activity, number 108, was the only one showing significant differences among the groups. Comparison One was the only comparison required, as the teacher educators were the only respondents not in agreement. The comparison may be found in Table XX.

In summary, Cooperating Personnel and Agencies was ranked tenth -- next to last -- by the five professional education groups. It drew an over-all mean response of 3.78 -- Important. The teacher educators responses were significantly higher than those of the other groups. Responses, from highest to lowest, were as follows: teacher educators 4.03, principals 3.77, supervisors 3.73, superintendents 3.73, and teachers of vocational agriculture 3.67.

TABLE XIX

MEAN RESPONSES OF FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF COOPERATING PERSONNEL AND AGENCIES TO THE PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Role Activity	Mean Responses					F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
	TE	VAT	SPV	FR	SPT		
108. Provide opportunity for pre-service professional staff to participate in research	4.33	3.56	3.67	3.52	3.68	6.96*	3.73
109. Provide individual pre-service training for students desiring training for work other than teaching	3.54	3.47	3.45	3.82	3.69	1.56	3.59
110. Establish a cooperating program with agricultural extension and federal agency personnel	3.90	3.66	3.71	3.73	3.61	0.63	3.72
111. Develop ability to recognize the value of complementary relationships with agencies and personnel involved in or related to the agricultural complex	4.35	3.99	4.10	4.02	3.93	2.24	4.08
ROLE MEAN	4.03	3.67	3.73	3.77	3.73		3.78

TABLE XX

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO ROLE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO COOPERATING PERSONNEL AND AGENCIES WHICH SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
108. Provide opportunity for pre-service professional staff to participate in research	6.80*	0.43	1.22	0.09

XI. ASSESSMENT OF FIRST YEAR TEACHING

The writer shares the belief of many leaders in the profession that the university staff has a marked responsibility to the graduate during his first year of teaching. This is the critical year, the teachers agree, yet many receive little, if any, help from the agricultural education staff.

Although Table XXI indicates an average mean response of only 3.98 -- Important -- two of the four activities received ratings above 4.00. Number 113 concerned first-year visitation by the agricultural education staff, and the teacher educators themselves gave a clear indication of their feelings with a high 4.70 -- Very Important -- rating. Important to the five professional groups also was activity 112, which dealt with evaluation of the pre-service program by first year graduates.

As revealed in Table XXII, these two activities also showed significant differences among the groups. Only one comparison was required, as the high responses of the teacher educators determined the source of the differences in both activities. These are given in Comparison One of Table XXII, with Comparison Two, Three and Four indicating non-significance.

Assessment of First Year Teaching was ranked seventh of the 11 items used in this study. The average role mean response was 3.98 -- Important. Once again, the teacher educators were highest in their regard for it with a response of 4.16. The remaining groups gave evaluations 4.00, 3.94, 3.93, and 3.86 representing supervisors, principals, superintendents, and teachers of agriculture, respectively.

TABLE XXI

MEAN RESPONSES OF FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS AS TO THE IMPORTANCE OF ASSESSMENT OF FIRST YEAR TEACHING THE THE PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Role Activity	Mean Responses					F-Ratio	Average Mean Responses
	TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT		
112. Conduct prescribed program for first year graduates as a basis of evaluating the pre-service program	4.42	3.85	3.96	4.08	3.92	3.95*	4.05
113. Conduct planned periodic visitation by Ag. Ed. staff of first year graduates while on the job	4.70	4.43	4.46	4.29	4.29	2.59*	4.43
114. Provide for immediate supervision of first year graduates by other than Ag. Ed. staff	3.80	3.52	3.90	3.56	3.53	2.39	3.66
115. Provide fifth year work as internship in a five-year pre-service program	3.72	3.64	3.66	3.81	3.97	1.01	3.76
ROLE MEAN	4.16	3.86	4.00	3.94	3.93		3.98

TABLE XXII

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO ROLE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO ASSESSMENT TO FIRST YEAR TEACHING WHICH SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Role Activity	Level of Significance			
	Comparison One	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four
112. Conduct prescribed program for first year graduates as a basis of evaluating the pre-service program	4.83*	0.85	1.13	0.26
113. Conduct planned periodic visitation by Ag. Ed. staff of first year graduates while on the job	4.72*	0.65	0.87	1.11

In a recent Louisiana study which included professional problems encountered by beginning vocational agricultural teachers, Reed (52) included the following among his conclusions:

1. Problems encountered by beginning teachers are not identical to those encountered by experienced teachers.

2. Professional problems of beginning teachers are recognized by administrators and supervisors.

3. Beginning teachers experienced problems in the areas of farm mechanics, advising the FFA, young and adult farmer programs and public relations.

4. Beginning and experienced teachers were not prepared to implement a program in work-experience.

These are only several of many weaknesses that were reported in the study, but they do represent a challenge to the agricultural education staff in a continuing effort to do a better job of placement and retention of teachers.

Even though none of the 115 role activities received a rating of (5) Very Important by the combined average of any group, a large number of the activities were given this rating by many individuals in each group. As shown below, at least 25 per cent of the teacher educators rated 79 of the 115 activities with the highest response used in this study. The number of activities similarly rated by the other groups were (1) Teachers of vocational agriculture -- 76 activities, (2) Supervisors -- 78 activities, (3) Principals -- 56 activities, and (4) Superintendents -- 71 activities.

Group	Number of Activities Rated Very Important by 25 Per Cent or More of the Group
Teacher Educators	79
Teachers of Vocational Agriculture	76
Supervisors	78
Principals	56
Superintendents	71

Data in Table XXIII indicate a rank order of the 11 teacher education role items based on the values assigned by the five groups of participants in the study. As revealed in the table, there is considerable agreement among the five professional education groups, especially regarding items rated highest and those rated lowest. All groups except the superintendents, for example, considered Student Teaching to hold the highest ranking. The superintendents ranked this item second, which was in close agreement since Technical Agriculture claimed their top rating, an item declared second by the remaining groups. Table XXIII also clearly recognizes the item of General Education as the last item with all groups ranking it eleventh. Preceding it was Cooperating Personnel and Agencies, ranked tenth by the teachers, supervisors and principals, and ninth by the superintendents. Teacher educators had a higher regard for this item, which is not surprising to the writer.

Departure from agreement between the five groups is more pronounced with reference to the remaining seven items. These are portrayed in the table, along with the rank average of each item, determined by the responses of the five professional groups.

TABLE XXIII

RANK ORDER OF 11 TEACHER EDUCATION ROLE ITEMS FROM THE RESPONSES OF THE FIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUPS

Role	Item	Rank Order of Groups				
		TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT
1.	Student Teaching	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
2.	Technical Agriculture	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	1.0
3.	Program Flexibility	5.0	5.0	3.5	2.5	4.0
4.	Organizations	4.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	8.0
5.	Professional Education	3.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	3.0
6.	Job Placement	7.5	4.0	5.0	6.0	5.0
7.	Assessment of First-Year Teaching	6.0	9.0	6.0	8.0	6.0
8.	Selection and Recruitment of Candidates	10.0	6.0	9.0	7.0	7.0
9.	State Programs and Certification	9.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	10.0
10.	Cooperating Personnel and Agencies	7.5	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0
11.	General Education	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0

Table XXIV gives an interesting account of the four comparisons by role item. These data reveal that the teacher educators responded significantly different from the other groups on seven of the eleven role items. This represents the widest departure from agreement in the four comparisons that were made. Comparison Two shows that the teachers of agriculture were in agreement with the three remaining groups, teacher educators excluded. Principals differed from the supervisors and superintendents on five of the role items, as indicated by Comparison Three of Table XXIV. Comparison Four, on the other hand, shows moderate agreement among the supervisors and superintendents, as they differed significantly on only two items, Technical Agriculture and Organizations.

Data in Table XXV project the activities to which 65 per cent or more of any group revealed a rating of very important. According to the table, eleven were so rated by the teacher educators, four by the agricultural teachers, one by the supervisors, one by the principals, and four by the superintendents.

Worthy of mention also is the data found in Table XXVI, where activities are listed to which at least 15 per cent of any one group responded with a rating of "No Value." As is shown in the table, twelve activities were given this rating by the teacher educators, twelve by the teachers of vocational agriculture, ten by the supervisors, six by the principals, and eight by the superintendents.

TABLE XXIV

FOUR COMPARISONS OF GROUP RESPONSES TO THE ELEVEN TEACHER EDUCATION ROLE ITEMS

Role Item	Level of Significance				
	Comparison One[a]	Comparison Two	Comparison Three	Comparison Four	Total
I. Selection and Recruitment of Candidates	0.51	0.47	2.00*	0.50	0.87
II. General Education	0.42	0.88	0.58	2.18*	1.78
III. Technical Agriculture	2.28*	0.80	0.75	0.81	0.99
IV. Professional Agriculture	2.34*	1.79	0.82	0.49	2.67*
V. Program Flexibility	2.61*	0.58	1.51	0.70	1.38
VI. Student Teaching	4.40*	0.04	2.24*	1.73	3.42*
VII. Job Placement	0.06	0.51	2.09*	1.03	1.16
VIII. Organizations	2.37*	1.33	2.74*	2.72*	3.81*
IX. State Programs and Certification	1.80	0.49	2.64*	1.71	2.08
X. Cooperating Personnel and Agencies	4.01*	0.83	0.51	0.09	2.77*
XI. Assessment of First Year Teaching	2.85*	0.71	0.46	0.88	1.80

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence

[a] Description of comparisons on page 9

TABLE XXV

ACTIVITIES WHICH RECEIVED A RATING OF (5) - VERY IMPORTANT - BY AT LEAST 65 PER CENT OF ANY GROUP

Role Activity	TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT
	- - - - - - Per Cent - - - - - - -				
10. Counsel individual with disability that would prevent normal performance of duties as a vocational agriculture teacher	65.9	36.8	35.3	37.2	38.1
29. Prepare students in the field of agri-business--its nature, scope, importance and relationship to the general economy	72.7	63.2	57.8	58.1	59.5
30. Develop ability to identify occupational opportunities that exist in the agri-business field	61.4	67.4	62.1	55.8	50.00
35. Develop new teaching materials for use in agri-business training	50.0	65.3	48.3	51.2	40.5
39. Provide training experience in professional preparation at off-campus centers, under supervision of university staff	70.5	46.3	40.5	27.9	35.7
47. Provide training in methods of teaching	81.8	57.9	64.7	60.5	73.8
49. Promote constant modification of teaching materials and techniques	65.9	49.5	54.3	53.5	64.3

(Continued)

TABLE XXV (Continued)

Role Activity	TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT
	- - - - - - Per Cent - - - - - - -				
51. Provide training for cooperation with teachers of communications, salesmanship, human relations, science and others for a more coordinated teaching effort at the high school level	52.3	36.8	41.4	51.2	69.0
55. Develop ability to conduct small group and individualized instruction	77.3	48.4	49.1	67.4	64.3
64. Develop ability of prospective teachers to provide curriculum to meet the needs of a wide variety of students in a class	79.5	54.7	58.6	55.8	66.7
77. Provide student teaching experiences for all agricultural education majors to be conducted in public high schools	84.1	67.4	77.6	53.5	66.7
78. Place students with definite occupational objectives in areas that will complement their objectives	65.9	54.7	55.2	48.8	47.6
87. Provide help in placement of graduates by staff members in agricultural education	72.7	55.8	54.3	39.5	50.0
88. Provide periodic listing of teaching vacancies through teachers, principals and superintendents	43.2	66.3	45.7	34.9	54.8
113. Conduct planned periodic visitation by Ag. Ed. staff of first year graduates while on the job	70.5	53.7	53.4	44.2	38.1

TABLE XXVI

ACTIVITIES WHICH RECEIVED A RATING OF (2) - NO VALUE - BY AT LEAST 15 PER CENT OF ANY GROUP

Role Activity	TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT
	- - - - - - Per Cent - - - - - - -
4. Require farm experience for entry into agricultural education curriculum	20.5	7.4	16.4	11.6	9.5
5. Require experience in high school vocational agriculture for entry into agricultural education curriculum	29.5	14.7	15.5	11.6	7.1
7. Require aptitude and/or achievement test scores for entry into advanced agricultural education curriculum	22.7	15.8	14.7	7.0	4.8
16. Require the same general education courses for all students preparing to teach	27.3	24.2	26.7	11.6	19.0
18. Remove the requirement of health and physical education and/or military science	38.6	36.8	34.5	41.9	42.9
19. Require pre-service preparation in communications other than English composition and literature	4.5	10.5	3.4	11.6	19.0
23. Require English proficiency test	25.0	22.1	12.1	7.0	16.7
25. Emphasize pre-service training geared to production agriculture	9.1	7.4	8.6	20.9	4.8

(Continued)

TABLE XXVI (Continued)

Role Activity	TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT
	- - - - - - Per Cent - - - - - - -				
42. Provide training in sociology of education	6.8	14.7	15.5	4.7	7.1
45. Provide training in philosophy of education	4.5	20.0	12.1	4.7	11.9
46. Provide training in history of education	18.2	30.5	23.3	14.0	21.4
65. Provide training for educational personnel such as cooperative extension workers and workers on foreign assignments	4.5	8.4	17.2	9.3	14.3
84. Rely on institution placement service	13.6	9.5	12.9	16.3	11.9
90. Encourage use of employment agency contracts	45.5	29.5	39.7	46.5	35.7
92. Maintain traditional future farmer organization	22.7	3.2	6.9	11.6	7.1
93. Encourage movement toward modification of the FFA to a more comprehensive agricultural organization	0.0	16.8	16.4	9.3	2.4
97. Continue traditional and current general pattern of certification to teach vocational agriculture under state laws	13.6	2.1	12.1	16.3	11.9
98. Require prospective graduates to demonstrate competencies required for entry into the profession, rather than certification based on prescribed course credits	20.5	9.5	3.4	7.0	4.8

(Continued)

TABLE XXVI (Continued)

Role Activity	TE	VAT	SPV	PR	SPT
	- - - - - - Per Cent - - - - - - -				
99. Consider certification of qualified persons in business and industry for teaching in specialized areas without traditional preparation as now required	11.4	25.3	8.6	11.6	16.7
100. Require satisfactory performance on national teacher examination for certification	54.5	45.3	50.9	46.5	40.5
109. Provide individual pre-service training for students desiring training for work other than teaching	22.7	16.8	13.8	9.3	4.8
114. Provide for immediate supervision of first year graduates by other than Ag. Ed. staff	9.1	17.9	10.3	14.0	14.3

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to determine emerging concepts of teacher education in agriculture as perceived by five professional education groups: Teacher Educators, Teachers of Vocational Agriculture, Supervisors of Vocational Agriculture, High School Principals, and Public School Superintendents. It was believed that since members of these groups are involved in directing programs in vocational education, the views they held for the pre-service curriculum would be valuable in planning and initiating needed changes.

The descriptive survey method of research was used. The mail questionnaire technique was utilized to gather data from the five professional groups with respect to the importance they placed on eleven role items and 115 role activities. The questionnaire was structured by the writer following a review of material pertinent to the pre-service curriculum in agricultural education and from suggestions given by professional associates. A committee of professional educators validated the data gathering device. Definitions of the role items and role activities for this study may be found in Chapter I. The role items presented to 450 persons invited to participate in the study were: (1) Selection and Recruitment of

Candidates, (2) General Education, (3) Technical Agriculture, (4) Professional Education, (5) Program Flexibility, (6) Student Teaching and Professional Internship, (7) Job Placement, (8) Organizations, (9) State Programs and Certification, (10) Cooperating Personnel and Agencies, and (11) Assessment of First Year Teaching.

Sampling of the population for this study was done in the following manner:

1. 100 per cent of the major land-grant institutions of the 48 contiguous United States offering teacher education in agricultural education. Responses were requested from department chairmen or staff members appointed by them.

2. Vocational agricultural teachers represented 16 states randomly drawn from each of the four regions of the United States (four states from each region). State directors of vocational agriculture were asked to supply the names of six individuals from their respective states.

3. 100 per cent of the state directors of vocational agriculture of the 48 contiguous United States.

4. 100 per cent of the area or district supervisors representing the 16 randomly drawn states.

5. Principals of public schools offering vocational agriculture, six from each of the 16 randomly drawn states, as selected by the state director of vocational agriculture of each state.

6. Superintendents of public schools offering vocational agriculture, six from each of the 16 randomly drawn states, as selected by the state director of vocational agriculture of each state.

Some explanation is in order with respect to questionnaire returns. The relatively large number of agricultural teachers (95) and supervisors (116) participating is explained by the fact that some principals and superintendents asked their teachers or vocational supervosors to respond for them. This, in turn, explains the relatively

low response from the principals (43) and superintendents (42). Forty-four of the teacher educators responded, indicating a high degree of interest in the study. A total of 450 questionnaires were mailed, with 340 being returned and useable for a 75.6 per cent return. An additional 29 questionnaires were received after the deadline had passed for coding the responses, representing an 82 per cent total return.

For convenience in tabulating and summarizing the data, the 340 participants were placed into the following groups:

1. Teacher Educators
2. Vocational Agricultural Teachers
3. Supervisors
4. Principals
5. Superintendents

A frequency distribution depicting the responses of the five groups to each of the 115 role activities can be found in Tables XXVII through XXXI of Appendix D.

The statistical method used in this study was the analysis of variance, considered to be a useful method of testing experimental hypotheses where several means are involved. Testing the overall significant differences among the means of the five professional groups was accomplished by the F-ratio. Since the F-ratio only indicates that at least one of the group means is significantly different from the others, four additional comparisons were made in an attempt to locate the source of the differences when the F-ratio was sufficiently large

to indicate significance at the .05 level of confidence. These comparisons were conducted as follows:

1. Comparison One: The responses of the teacher educators were compared with the combined responses of the other four groups.

2. Comparison Two: The responses of the vocational agricultural teachers were compared with the combined responses of the three remaining groups - teacher educators excluded.

3. Comparison Three: The responses of the principals were compared with the combined responses of the supervisors and superintendents.

4. Comparison Four: The responses of the supervisors were compared with the responses of the superintendents.

Comparison One tested the hypothesis that the teacher educators gave the same response as the average of the other four groups, while Comparison Two tested the hypothesis that the teachers of vocational agriculture gave the same response as the average of the three remaining groups, teacher educators excluded. Similarly, Comparison Three tested the hypothesis that the principals gave the same response as the average of the supervisors and superintendents, and Comparison Four tested the hypothesis that the supervisors gave the same response as the superintendents.

The eleven role items concerning the undergraduate curriculum in agricultural education were rated Important as evidenced by the combined responses of the five groups. The role items and the ratings they received were as follows:

1. Very Important -- none

2. Important

a.	Student Teaching and Professional Internship	4.29
b.	Technical Agriculture	4.20
c.	Program Flexibility	4.09
d.	Organizations	4.09
e.	Professional Education	4.06
f.	Job Placement	4.03
g.	Assessment of First Year Teaching	3.98
h.	Selection and Recruitment of Candidates	3.93
i.	State Programs and Certification	3.88
j.	Cooperating Personnel and Agencies	3.78
k.	General Education	3.59

3. Little Importance -- none

4. No Value -- none

The above evaluation of the 11 selected role items is an indication of the overall importance designated them by the five groups of participants. Significant differences were noted in all 11 role items and 53 role activities, while the five groups were in general agreement with respect to the remaining 62 role activities.

Selection and Recruitment of Candidates drew an average mean rating of 3.93 -- Important -- from the five professional education groups. Significant differences were observed in the responses of the groups to nine of the fifteen activities listed under this role item. The activities were (1) Conduct Recruitment Program . . ., (4) Require Farm Experience . . ., (5) Require High School Vocational Agriculture . . ., (7) Require Aptitude and/or Achievement Test Scores . . ., (9) Provide Training for both Sexes . . ., (11) Provide Orientation to Program . . ., (14) Undertake Studies to Identify Potential Students . . ., and (15) Provide Grants or Scholarships.

The teacher educators rated activities (1), (6), (9), and (11) higher than any other group. Conversely, they rated activities (5) and (7) lower than any of the remaining four groups, while activity (4) received an evaluation that was lower than the average of the other groups. The Superintendents gave the lowest average response to Selection and Recruitment of Candidates, but the four groups were separated by only .10 of a point. This role item was rated Important or Very Important by 69.4 per cent of the teacher educators, 69.3 per cent of the teachers of vocational agriculture, 68.4 per cent of the supervisors, 65.1 per cent of the principals, and 66.0 per cent of the superintendents. Percentages of the five groups rating this role item Very Important were: teacher educators 31.6, vocational agricultural teachers 30.5, supervisors 27.2, principals 23.7, and superintendents 24.9. Responses termed No Value or of Little Importance were given by 28.5 per cent of the teacher educators, 27.9 per cent of the teachers of vocational agriculture, 26.7 per cent of the supervisors, 31.6 per cent of the principals, and 30.6 per cent of the superintendents. Percentages of these groups responding as Undecided were: teacher educators 2.1, teachers of vocational agriculture 2.7, supervisors 10.3, principals 3.3, and superintendents 3.3.

Combining the responses of all participants regarding Selection and Recruitment of Candidates, 67.7 per cent rated it Important or higher, while 32.3 per cent regarded it as being of Little Importance or lower.

A glance at the role item General Education points to significant differences with respect to six of the eight activities listed under it. The overall role mean of 3.59 -- Important -- was the lowest assigned any of the 11 role items by the five professional groups. The six activities denoting significant differences at the .05 level were (16) Require the same General Education Courses for All Students Preparing to Teach, (19) Require Pre-Service Preparation in Communications Other Than English Composition and Literature, (20) Require Demonstration of Competency in General Education, (21) Provide Training in General Economics, (22) Provide Training in Rural Sociology, and (23) Require English Proficiency Test.

One of the activities, (17) Provide List of Alternative Courses from Which Agricultural Education Students Could Choose in the Areas of Communication, Social Science and Humanities, received an Important rating from the combined responses of the five groups. On the other hand, activity (18) Remove the Requirement of Health and Physical Education and/or Military Science was given a low rating by all groups. Of the six activities revealing significant differences, the teacher educators were at odds with their counterparts on numbers (16), (19), (20), and (23), coming out very strongly for activity (19) Require Pre-Service Preparation in Communications Other Than English and Literature.

General Education was rated Important or higher by 57.7 per cent of the teacher educators, 51.6 per cent of the high school teachers, 51.1 per cent of the supervisors, 62.5 per cent of the principals, and

60.1 per cent of the superintendents. In the same order, this role item was evaluated as of No Value or of Little Importance by 39.2, 43.4, 43.5, 34.9, and 36.3 per cent of the groups. Also of interest was the Important rating that the superintendents gave activity (22) Provide Training in Rural Sociology, with the other four groups rating it much lower.

The overall mean response assigned Technical Agriculture by the five groups was 4.20 -- Important. This role item evaluation was exceeded only by Student Teaching and Professional Internship. Selected activities for this item numbered 15, and all but three received a rating of 4.00 or higher. The three that received responses less than 4.00 were (25) Emphasize Training Geared to Production Agriculture, (26) Develop Ability to Understand Importance of Training in Career Information and Choice at Elementary and Junior High Levels, and (34) Provide Course Offerings in Agri-business Taught by Agricultural Economics Faculty.

Significant differences among the five groups occurred with only two activities. These were (26) Develop Ability to Understand Importance of Training in Career Information and Choice at Elementary and Junior High Levels, and (33) Provide Course Offerings in Agri-business Taught by Agricultural Education Faculty. In both instances, Comparison One revealed the sources of differences as the teacher educators responded with the highest rating of the former and the lowest on the latter.

As might be expected, the teacher educators and teachers of vocational agriculture had the highest regard for Technical Agriculture,

and the lowest was given by the principals and superintendents. Teacher educators were consistently higher in their responses to Technical Agriculture activities, followed closely by the high school teachers and supervisors. To show the emphasis placed on this item, the following percentages are representative of the responses that were Important and Very Important: teacher educators 83.8 per cent, agricultural teachers 79.6 per cent, supervisors 81.3 per cent, principals 86.7 per cent and superintendents 78.2 per cent.

The Professional Education role item, which consisted of 24 role activities, was generally accepted as being Important by the five groups, receiving an average mean response of 4.06. Fourteen of the activities were rated above 4.00, and nine were rated above 3.50. Activity (46) Provide Training in History of Education, was in least favor with the participants, receiving a low rating of 3.14 -- Little Importance. Three activities were given evaluations above 4.50 by the average of the groups, indicating a large number of Very Important ratings by the individuals. These were (47) Provide Training in Methods of Teaching -- 4.64, (49) Promote Constant Modification of Teaching Materials and Techniques -- 4.51, and (55) Develop Ability to Conduct Small Group and Individualized Instruction -- 4.57.

The teacher educators' responses to Professional Education averaged 4.21 -- highest of the five groups, while the agricultural teachers' 3.92 was the lowest of the groups. Significant differences

among the five groups were detected in regard to 14 of the 24 activities. Comparison One revealed that the teacher educators' replies differed from those of the other four groups on nine of the fourteen activities. The other comparisons and numbers of activities showing significant differences were as follows: Comparison Two -- 5, Comparison Three -- 4, and Comparison Four -- 4. Even though differences were apparent in a majority of the items, the variation in responses between the groups was not drastic. As an illustration, activity (56) Introduce the Concept of Differentiated Teaching Roles, indicated a difference existed at the .05 level of confidence, but none was exhibited in the four comparisons that were made. The regard by the five groups for Professional Education in pre-service training was shown by the percentage responses that were Important or Very Important. These were: teacher educators 77.8 per cent, agricultural teachers 65.7 per cent, supervisors 70.3 per cent, principals 77.2 per cent, and superintendents 81.9 per cent.

Program Flexibility was an item that was conceived to be Important to all groups of participants. The overall role mean was 4.09, with teacher educators favoring it the most with a 4.19 rating. Only three of the thirteen activities revealed significant differences. Activity (66) Provide Training in FFA Sponsored Contests, revealed a difference in Comparison One, where the teacher educators' responses averaged only 3.58.

This represents the lowest evaluation of any group for any activity listed under Program Flexibility. Activity (67) Provide

sufficient free electives for more specialized training . . . also brought out a difference in Comparison One, as the teacher trainers reacted with a high 4.59 rating. The third activity, number (74) Support the Premise That Vocational Education is the Logical and Proper Vehicle to Move Disadvantaged Into the Mainstream of Life, drew significant differences in both Comparison Three and Comparison Four. The sources of the difference in both cases was the relatively low evluation of 3.69 given the activity by the superintendents.

The importance of flexibility in the pre-service curriculum of today's agricultural education is depicted by the responses regarding this role item as having No Value by the averages of the five groups of professional educators. These were: Teacher educators 2.8 per cent, vocational agricultural teachers 3.9 per cent, supervisors 4.0 per cent, principals 4.1 per cent, and supervisors 3.5 per cent.

The eight activities listed under Student Teaching and Professional Internship received the highest overall rating of the eleven role items submitted for evaluation -- 4.29. Of the activities selected for this study, the one providing for student teaching experiences for all agricultural education majors to be conducted in public high schools was rated highest -- 4.62. The teacher educators and supervisors rated this activity 4.73 and 4.78, respectively, indicating their approval of the traditional program with regard to this activity. A significant difference for this activity was found among the groups, and, upon further testing, Comparison Four revealed that the superintendents assigned a value of 4.40 as compared to the 4.78 average response of

the supervisors. A difference was also noted with respect to activity (81) Provide for Student Teaching Seminars, where Comparisons One and Three revealed that the teacher trainers' and principals' responses were higher than the group averages they were compared with. Number (82) Provide Training in "Team" and "Cooperative" Teaching Techniques, presented a like picture in Comparison One and Three, as the teacher trainers and principals were again higher in their ratings. The significant difference that was indicated in activity (83) Provide Experience with Continuing Education Program, was located in Comparison One. The teacher educators' 4.55 rating was considerably higher than the average of the other four groups. Data concerning Student Teaching and Professional Internship clearly showed the high regard held by all five groups. The responses given for this role item that were Important or Very Important were as follows: Teacher educators 88.9 per cent, teachers of vocational agriculture 80.4 per cent, supervisors 81.9 per cent, principals 88.9 per cent, and superintendents 90.2 per cent.

Job Placement received a combined average rating of 4.03 -- Important -- from the five professional groups. Six of the seven activities listed under this item were rated Important, and the other as having Little Importance. Activity (90) Encourage Use of Employment Agency Contracts, received the low average response of 2.82. Comparisons One and Three showed significant differences for this activity resulting from a low teacher educator response of 2.56 -- Little Importance -- and a higher evaluation of 3.11 given by the

principals. These two activities lowered the role average, since the remaining five activities earned a 4.37 rating, which is much larger than the role mean of 4.03. This is further substantiated by the fact that only a 9.0 per cent average of all groups regarded Job Placement as having No Value to the pre-service curriculum in agricultural education. The second activity that produced significant differences was number (88) Provide Periodic Listing of Teaching Vacancies Through Teachers, Principals and Superintendents. These differences were revealed in three of the four comparisons that were made. The teacher trainers responded significantly lower than the average responses of the other groups -- Comparison One, while Comparisons Two and Three had the agricultural teachers and principals showing higher ratings than the average of the groups they were equated with.

Related Organizations, according to the participants in this study, is an Important role to be assumed by the teacher educators in agricultural education. Only the superintendents gave it a rating of less than 4.00. The overall role mean was 4.09 -- Important -- with a response range from 3.86 (superintendents) to 4.20 (teacher educators). Of the six activities proposed for evaluation, five produced differences of significance at the .05 level of confidence. General agreement among the five groups was evidenced in number (96) Provide for Use of Professional Organizations as "Partners" in Teacher Education. The activities revealing differences were: (91) Provide Training on Importance of Youth Organizations,

(92) Maintain Traditional Future Farmer Organization, (93) Encourage Movement Toward Modification of the FFA to a More Comprehensive Agricultural Organization, (94) Promote Increased Participation in Collegiate Organizations and Activities, and (95) Provide Information Concerning the Importance of Professional Organizations to Workers in the Field.

Teacher educators differed with their counterparts in regard to each of the above activities. On the average, they responded higher to all except number (92) Maintain Traditional Future Farmer Organization, where their average response was only 3.17 -- Little Importance. Comparison Two indicated that only the agricultural teachers are content with the traditional FFA organization when compared with supervisors, principals and superintendents. The teachers' rating of 4.35 was also in contrast to the lower response of the teacher educators. Comparison Three, testing the principals against the superintendents and supervisors, showed a significantly higher response to activity (93) Encourage Movement Toward Modification of the FFA to a More Comprehensive Agricultural Organization, by the principals. The supervisors and principals were at odds on three occasions. In each case, the superintendents gave lower evaluations to activity numbers (91) Provide Training on Importance of Youth Organizations, (92) Maintain Traditional Future Farmer Organization, and (95) Provide Information Concerning the Importance of Professional Organizations to Workers in the Field.

Overall, 77.7 per cent of the participants evaluated Related Organizations as Important or higher, while 8.8 per cent believed the item to be of No Value or were undecided at the time of evaluation.

The combined average of all group responses indicated that opinions were varied concerning State Programs and Certification. The data here appeared to justify some of the new concepts and innovations observed in the review of literature for this study. It is still apparent, however, that a number of workers in the profession are reluctant to seek new horizons in the agricultural education curriculum.

The average mean response for State Programs and Certification was 3.81 -- Important. None of the five professional groups rated it above 3.95. The teacher trainers were highest in their responses with an average role mean of 3.95, while the superintendents were lowest with a 3.71 average evaluation. Ten of the activities garnered Important ratings, and one, number (100) Require Satisfactory Performance on National Teacher Examination for Certification, was given a low evaluation by the average of the five groups.

The teacher trainers' responses differed from the average of the remaining four groups with respect to four of the five activities in Comparison One. Activity (97) Continue Traditional and Current General Pattern of Certification . . ., found the teacher trainers with less regard than the other participants, while they responded with the highest rating on numbers (104) Encourage Increased Supervisor, (105) Provide Itinerant Teacher Trainer to Assist Teachers on the Job, and (107) Provide Teacher Educator to Assist Local School Personnel . . . Comparison Two showed that the agricultural teachers rated activity (97) an Important 4.06, the only significant difference noted with this comparison. There were three activities denoting

significant differences in Comparison Four. In all three instances, the supervisors responded with higher evaluations as compared to the superintendents. These were numbers (102) Provide for Continuing Funds for Specialized Training Programs . . ., (104) and (105) mentioned previously.

The general lack of support for State Programs and Certification was shown by an average of 36.8 per cent of all participants who rated State Programs and Certification as having Little Importance or lower.

The four activities listed under Cooperating Personnel and Agencies drew a role mean of 3.78 from all five groups of educators. The teacher educators rated this item 4.03 -- Important -- as a group, with the agricultural teachers supplying the lowest rating of 3.67. Activity (111) Develop Ability to Recognize the Value of Complementary Relationships with Agencies and Personnel . . ., received a 4.08 -- Important -- rating, highest of the four. A combination of the responses of all participants, 62.4 per cent rated it Important or higher, while 37.6 per cent thought it was of Little Importance or less.

Finally, the four role activities comprising the Assessment of First Year Teaching received an average mean response of 3.98 -- Important. Two of the activities, (112) Conduct Prescribed Program for First Year Graduates as a Basis of Evaluating the Pre-Service Program, and (113) Conduct Planned Periodic Visitation by Agricultural Education Staff of First Year Graduates while on the Job, were given Important ratings of 4.05 and 4.43, respectively. The remaining

two, (114) Provide for Immediate Supervision of First Year Graduates by Other than Agricultural Education Staff, and (115) Provide Fifth Year Work as Internship in a Five-Year Pre-Service Program, met with less favor among the groups with ratings of 3.66 and 3.76, in that order. In all, a total of 68.4 per cent of the professional educators regarded Assessment of First Year Teaching as an Important function of the pre-service program, while 31.6 per cent rated it of Little Importance or less.

A summary of the evaluation of the 115 role activities used in this study indicates the importance designated each activity by the average response of all groups.

Activities that received a rating of Very Important were:

... Prepare students in the field of agri-business - its nature, scope, importance and relationship to the general economy

... Develop ability to identify occupational opportunities that exist in the agri-business field

... Provide training in methods of teaching

... Promote constant modification of teaching materials and techniques

... Develop ability to conduct small group and individualized instruction

... Develop ability of prospective teachers to provide curriculum to meet the needs of a wide variety of students in a class

... Provide student teaching experiences for all agricultural education majors to be conducted in public high schools

Activities that received a rating of Important were:

... Conduct recruitment program in high schools and community colleges within limitations of state and institution regulations

... Identify student with agricultural education curriculum at freshman academic level

... Require practical agricultural experience for entry into agricultural education curriculum

... Require grade or quality point average for entry into advanced agricultural education curriculum

... Require conformity to general appearance and personal habits for entry into agricultural education curriculum

... Provide pre-service training for qualified individuals of both sexes

... Counsel individual with disability that would prevent normal performance of duties as a vocational agriculture teacher

... Provide orientation to program by appropriate staff member for entry into agricultural education curriculum

... Furnish occupational information such as need for graduates, opportunity for advancement, requirements for entry and certification to high school graduates and community and junior college students

... Develop positive working relationship with Guidance Counselors, teachers in elementary and junior high schools and agricultural business personnel

... Undertake studies to identify potentially outstanding prospects for the teacher training program

... Provide grants or scholarships to trainees who are deserving

... Provide list of alternative courses from which agricultural education students could choose in the areas of communication, social science and humanities

... Require pre-service preparation in communications other than English composition and literature

... Require prospective teachers to demonstrate competency in the area of general education preparation

... Provide pre-service training in general economics

... Provide training in rural sociology

... Develop responsibility for the preparation of high school students in areas not traditionally recognized as agriculture

... Emphasize pre-service training geared to production agriculture

... Develop ability to understand importance of training in career information and choice at elementary and junior high levels

... Combine and intensify related courses to allow for additional courses in the curriculum

... Update teacher preparation in training for farming to more adequately meet current demands

... Modify existing curricula offerings to include pre-service agri-business training

... Develop cooperative training in agri-business involving the institution and business

... Provide course offerings in agri-business taught by agricultural education faculty

... Provide course offerings in agri-business taught by agricultural economics faculty

... Develop new teaching materials for use in agri-business training

... Provide job-analysis training related to principles and procedures in agri-business

... Provide agri-business internship in specialization area or area of choice

... Provide for resource personnel in off-farm agricultural occupations

... Provide training experiences in professional preparation at off-campus centers, under supervision of university staff

... Place all vocational students in job related vocational courses

... Require job related occupational experiences or demonstrated competence of prospective teachers of vocational agriculture prior to certification

... Provide training in sociology of education

... Provide training in psychology of education

... Provide training for preparation of teaching materials

... Provide training in philosophy of education

... Provide training in principles and practices in general education

... Provide training for integration of curriculum content

... Provide training for cooperation with teachers of communications, salesmanship, human relations, science and others for a more coordinated teaching effort at the high school level

... Develop skills in the function of research in today's agricultural field

... Bring university and secondary school personnel together for more effective programs in teacher preparation

... Develop skills in procedures that are clinically and case-study oriented

... Introduce the concept of differentiated teaching roles

... Provide training on classroom and non-classroom teaching behavior

... Provide training in vocational guidance principles

... Provide pre-service t aining in preparation for judging contests

... Train students for directing the occupational development process

... Develop ability to provide adult and young farmer instruction

... Develop ability to aid in establishing boys in farming

... Emphasize importance of training workers at all levels of competence

... Provide training for educational personnel such as cooperative extension workers and workers on foreign assignments

... Provide training in FFA sponsored contests

... Provide sufficient free elective credits to allow for more specialized training in the pre-service program for those desiring it

... Provide training for prospective teachers in adult classes for persons engaged in farming and agricultural business to help them adjust to changing technology, new products, new methods and current needs of people

... Provide additional course work at the pre-service level for preparing prospective teachers to work with disadvantaged students

... Develop ability to recognize peculiar problems of both students of different ethnic and social groups

... Conduct special invitational institutes, workshops and conferences involving opinion leaders among vocational agricultural teachers

... Provide in-school student teaching experiences in disadvantaged areas

... Develop internships which will provide appropriate experiences for teaching the disadvantaged

... Support the premise that vocational education is the logical and proper vehicle to move disadvantaged into the mainstream of life

... Require observation of in-service setting prior to and following student teaching

... Conduct pre-student teaching training sessions individually and collectively

... Place students with definite occupational objectives in areas that will complement their objectives

... Provide cooperative off-campus student teaching centers involving educational institutions, business and industry supervisory personnel

... Provide substantial remuneration for efforts of critic or supervising teachers

... Provide for student teaching seminars

... Provide training in "team" and "cooperative" teaching techniques

... Provide experience with continuing education programs

... Rely on institution placement service

... Provide training on expected and acceptable employment procedures and practices

... Encourage prospective graduates to develop personal data sheet for employment purposes

... Provide help in placement of graduates by staff members in agricultural education

... Provide periodic listing of teaching vacancies through teachers, principals and superintendents

... Provide prospective employers with the aspects of agriculture the graduate is most qualified to teach

... Provide training on importance of youth organizations and activities

... Maintain traditional future farmers organization

... Encourage movement toward modification of the FFA to a more comprehensive agricultural organization

... Promote increased participation in collegiate organizations and activities

... Provide information concerning the importance of professional organizations to workers in the field

... Provide for use of professional organizations as "partners" in teacher education

... Continue traditional and current general pattern of certification to teach vocational agriculture under state laws

... Require prospective graduates to demonstrate competencies required for entry into the profession, rather than certification based on prescribed course credits

... Consider certification of qualified persons in business and industry for teaching in specialized areas without traditional preparation as now required

... Upgrade agricultural teachers with special or provisional certificates for eventual certification and professional growth

... Provide in state programs for continuing funds for the kinds of training not provided by the institution for preparation of other teachers, such as non-credit in-service programs, internships for graduates and development of instructional materials

... Provide for annual review of budgets and activities by university and state staffs for modification in terms of current needs

... Encourage increased supervisory contact with vocational agricultural teachers by area or district supervisor

... Provide itinerant teacher trainer to assist teachers on the job

... Provide teacher educator with specialty in technical subject matter to assist teachers on the job

... Provide teacher educator with training and experience to assist local school personnel in planning the program in vocational agriculture

... Provide opportunity for pre-service professional staff to participate in research

... Provide individual pre-service training for students desiring training for work other than teaching

... Establish a cooperative program with agricultural extension and federal agency personnel

... Develop ability to recognize the value of complimentary relationships with agencies and personnel involved in or related to the agricultural complex

... Conduct prescribed program for first year graduates as a basis of evaluating the pre-service program

... Conduct planned periodic visitation by Ag. Ed. staff of first year graduates while on the job

... Provide for immediate supervision of first year graduates by other than Ag. Ed. staff

... Provide fifth year work as internship in a five-year pre-service program

Activities that were conceived to be of Little Importance were:

... Require farm experience for entry into agricultural education curriculum

... Require experience in high school vocational agriculture for entry into agricultural education curriculum

... Require aptitude and/or achievement test scores for entry into agricultural education curriculum

... Require the same general education courses for all students preparing to teach

... Remove the requirement of health and physical education and/or military science

... Require English proficiency test

... Provide training in history of education

... Encourage use of employment agency contracts

... Require satisfactory performance on national teacher examination for certification

Conclusions

The following conclusions resulted from the responses of five professional groups made up of 340 individuals who participated in this study. Eleven role items consisting of 115 role activities regarding the pre-service teacher education program in agricultural education were submitted to the five groups for their evaluation.

1. Significant disagreement was noted to the responses to the 11 role items by five professional education groups who participated in this study. Special mention is noted that differences occurred between those responsible for pre-service training (teacher educators), those responsible for high school instruction (teachers of vocational agriculture and supervisors), and those responsible for administration (principals and superintendents).

2. There was agreement among the five groups of participants regarding the role items rated highest and the one rated lowest. As revealed in Table XXIII on page 87, all groups except the superintendents considered Student Teaching and Professional Internship the most important role item. The superintendents ranked it second, however, Technical Agriculture received the second highest average response of four of the five professional groups, with the superintendents ranking it first in importance. General Education was considered the least important by the average responses of all five groups.

3. The teacher educators gave the highest average evaluation to eight of the 11 role items. These were Student Teaching and Professional Internship, Technical Agriculture, Organizations, Program Flexibility, Professional Education, Assessment of First Year Teaching, State Programs and Certification, and Cooperating Personnel and Agencies. The teacher educator responses were significantly different from the average of the other groups with regard to 42 of the 53 activities that indicated differences of significance.

4. The superintendents gave the lowest average evaluation to six of the 11 role items. These were Student Teaching and Professional Internship, Organizations, Program Flexibility, Job Placement, Selection and Recruitment of Candidates, and State Programs and Certification. This is an indication of their overall lower regard for the pre-service teacher education program in agricultural education.

5. These data indicate three rather distinct groups when the average group responses by role items were compared. These are given as follows:

   a. Teacher Educators - highest overall rating of items.
   b. Principals and Superintendents - lowest overall rating of items.
   c. Teacher of Vocational Agriculture and Supervisors - consistent overall agreement with ratings between those of the teacher educators, and principals and superintendents.

6. All 11 of the role items are concluded to be important roles of teacher education in agriculture, even though the five groups of participatns were not in complete agreement on any of the role items.

7. None of the role items received an average mean response of 5.00 -- Very Important -- although many participants responded with this evaluation of some of the 115 activities.

8. Six of the role items were rated Important by the average of all groups. These included: Technical Agriculture; Professional Education; Program Flexibility; Student Teaching and Professional Internship; Job Placement; and Organizations.

9. Five of the role items were rated as having Little Importance by the average of all groups. These included: Selection and Recruitment of Candidates; General Education; State Programs and Certification; Cooperative Personnel and Agencies; and Assessment of First Year Teaching.

10. A limited number of activities that were not considered to be relevant by the standards of many in the profession were responsible for lowering the ratings of several role items. Several of these were (7) Require Aptitude and/or Achievement Test, (18) Remove the Requirement of Health and P.E. and/or Military Science, (46) Provide Training in History of Education, (90) Encourage Use of Employment Agency Contracts, and (100) Require Satisfactory Performance on National Teacher Examination for Certification.

11. The hypothesis that the groups participating in this study had similar concepts relative to expected performance of teacher education in agriculture was rejected at the .05 level of confidence on all 11 role items and 53 role activities. This hypothesis was accepted for 62 activities.

12. Similarly, the hypotheses regarding the four comparisons were concluded as follows:

    a. The hypothesis that the responses of the teacher educators would be similar to the average of the responses of the other four groups was accepted for 11 and rejected for 42 of the 53 activities that revealed significant differences.

    b. The hypothesis that the responses of the teachers of vocational agriculture would not be significantly different from the average of the other three groups, teacher educators excluded, was accepted for 47 and rejected for 6 of the 53 activities that revealed significant differences.

c. The hypothesis that the responses of the high school principals would not differ significantly from the combined responses of the supervisors and superintendents was accepted for 39 and rejected for 14 of the 53 activities that revealed significant differences.

d. The hypothesis that the responses of the supervisors would not differ significantly from those of the superintendents was accepted for 37 and rejected for 16 of the 53 activities that revealed significant differences.

Recommendations

1. Because of differences noted in the study, agricultural educators should direct their efforts toward gaining agreement among all persons concerned with teacher training functions. The need was evidenced by the differences noted in the responses of the five groups of professional educators who participated in this study. This could possibly be accomplished through a program of involvement initiated at the state level. A series of conferences with planned objectives could have far-reaching influence in unifying concepts regarding a relevant pre-service program in agricultural teacher education.

2. Teacher educators should involve other professional educators and business people who are responsible for directing the work of the graduates of the agricultural education program. The wide departure of teacher educator responses from those of the other four groups selected for this study is a strong indication that the teacher educators are not attuned to today's setting.

3. As a means of unifying concepts and views concerning preservice training in agricultural education, teacher educators should strive for more involvement through the first year of employment of graduates.

4. Members of the profession should work for flexible certification standards. Traditional programs can be changed little if they are bound by law. This may be accomplished through organization of qualified representatives for study and proper presentation.

5. Teacher education in agriculture should provide training that is needed or expect to continue to lose status in this respect. Most curricula are fixed so that students have little, if any, opportunity for selection. Inroads have been made through the option approach.

6. Teacher educators should increase efforts to alleviate university restrictions regarding curriculum in agricultural education. Involvement with the various schools, departments and curriculum committees will be necessary. It is doubtful that many needs have ever been made known through proper channels and at the right time.

7. Pre-service training in agricultural education should no longer be geared to production agriculture, as evidenced by the findings of this study. Program Flexibility was conceived to be an important function.

8. Teacher educators should consider seeking help in the area of job placement for graduates. Most would express a keen sense of responsibility here, but the expression of the agricultural teachers in this study would indicate a need for additional consideration.

9. The research function of teacher education in agriculture should be continually promoted. This study revealed that the teacher trainers themselves recognize this. Provisions such as teaching load adjustments may be required if significant progress is made. Research that is not utilized by dissemination and practice is of little value.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

1. Cardozier, V. R. (ed.). Teacher Education in Agriculture. Danville: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1967.

2. Carter, Kirsten (ed.). Changing Dimensions in Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1967.

3. Carter, Kirsten (ed.). Teacher Education: Issues and Innovations. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

4. Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: David McKay Company, 1967.

5. Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

6. Hemsing, Esther D. (ed.). Realignments for Teacher Education. Washington, D. C: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970.

7. Hoover, Norman K. Handbook of Agricultural Occupations. Danville: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963.

8. Masoner, Paul. A Design for Teacher Education. Pittsburg: University Press, 1963.

9. Phipps, Lloyd J. Handbook on Teaching Vocational Agriculture. Danville: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1966.

10. Rudbek, Virginia (ed.). Frontiers in Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1966.

11. Smith, E. Brooks, Hans C. Olsen, Patrick J. Johnson, Chandler Barbour. Partnership in Teacher Education. Washington, D. C: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

12. Zahary, Anne Marie (ed.). Reality and Relevance. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

13. Zahary, Anne Marie (ed.). Teacher Education: Action for Americans. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

14. Kemp, Barbara H. "The Youth We Haven't Served," United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OE-80028, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

15. United States Congress, Public Law No. 347, Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, Sixty-fourth Congress, S. 703, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, February 23, 1917, Section 10.

16. United States Congress. Public Law 88-210, Vocational Education Act of 1963, Eighty-Eighth Congress, H. R. 4955, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, December, 1963, Section 10, Ammendment.

17. United States Congress. Public Law 90-576, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Ninetieth Congress, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, July, 1968.

18. United States Department of Labor. Manpower Report of the President and a Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training. Washington, D. C: Government Printing Office, 1967.

19. United States Office of Education. Education for a Changing World of Work. Report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, OE-80021, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U. S. Government Printing Office: Washington, D. C., 1964.

PERIODICALS

20. Albracht, James J. "Industry Function Approach to Vocational Education Curriculum Development," Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 7:11 July, 1967.

21. Atherton, J. C. "Where Do We Stand In Curriculum Improvement," Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 5:22, November, 1965.

22. Baker, Richard A. "Curriculum Construction and Course Planning in Farm Power and Machinery," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 38:136, December, 1965.

23. Bennett, William C. and Duane L. Blake. "Soil and Fertilizer Competencies Needed by Farmers," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 38:176, February, 1966.

24. Binkley, Harold and W. C. Montgomery, "Pilot Programs in Agricultural Occupations," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:162, January, 1967.

25. Brooking, Walter J. and H. N. Hunsicker, "More Skilled Agricultural Technicians are Needed," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 38:278-9, June, 1966.

26. Burkett, Lowell A. "Latest Word from Washington," American Vocational Journal, 44:6, September, 1969.

27. Clark, Raymond M. and Alvin E. Oliver. "Post-High School Curriculum for the Grain, Feed, Seed, and Farm Supply Industry," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:108, November, 1966.

28. Committee on Educational Policy in Agriculture, "The Agricultural Science," Bio Science, 15:249-53, May, 1965.

29. Grote, C. Nelson. "Our Main Challenge -- The 1968 Amendments," American Vocational Journal, 44:8, September, 1969.

30. Martin, Howard W. "Guidelines for Curricula for OFAO," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 37:216-18, March, 1965.

31. McClay, David R. "Emerging Patterns for Preparing Teachers," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 40:127, December, 1967.

32. McComas, J. D. "Vocational Education -- A Missing Element in Curriculum Development," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 40:134-5, December, 1967.

33. Miller, Russel L. "Advising From the Advisor -- Teacher Viewpoint," The Journal of the National Association of Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture, 13:84, December, 1969.

34. O'Brien, John L. "Vocational Education Can Meet Special Needs of Youth," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 39:54-7, September, 1967.

35. Scarborough, Cayce. "Teacher Preparation," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 40:123, December, 1967.

36. Schaller, Herbert L. Guest Editorial, The Agricultural Education Magazine, 26:207-8, March, 1954.

37. Schillace, Ralph. "Teachings Third Dimension," The Journal of the National Association of Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture, 14:3, March, 1970.

38. Shapiro, Karl. "English Proficiency -- A Critical Need," Houston Chronicle, Houston, Texas, Sunday, April 26, 1970, p. 16-c.

39. Thompson, O. E. and J. A. Rudd. "Trends in Undergraduate Preparation of Teachers," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 40:128-9, December, 1967.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

40. Baker, Richard A. "A Study of Employment Opportunities in Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations in Alabama." Unpublished Report, School of Education, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, (Mimeographed).

41. Davies, Don. "EDPA and Vocational Education." Paper presented at Second Annual National Vocational-Technical Teacher Education Seminar, Chicago, Illinois, October, 1968.

42. Martin, W. Howard. "Agricultural Education: Image and Substance." Lecture presented at the American Vocational Association Convention, Boston, Massachusetts, 1969.

43. Mondart, C. L., Sr. "Developments in Vocational Agriculture and Their Impact Upon Teacher Education Programs." Paper presented at the Southern Regional Conference for Agricultural Education, Raleigh, North Carolina, April, 1970.

44. Warmbrod, J. Robert. "Curriculum Research in Agricultural Education." Paper read at the Central Region Conference in Agricultural Education, Columbus, The Ohio State University, August 1, 1967, (Mimeographed).

45. Warmbrod, J. Robert and Lloyd J. Phipps. "Review and Synthesis of Research in Agricultural Education." Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1966.

MONOGRAPHS

46. Brookover, Wilbur B. and Sigmund Nosow. A Sociological Analysis of Vocational Education in the United States. A special study prepared for the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, July, 1962.

47. Christal, Raymond E. "Implications of Air Force Occupational Research or Curriculum Design." Process and Techniques of Vocational Curriculum Development. Report of a Seminar, Minnesota R. C. U., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, April, 1970.

48. Clark, Raymond M. A Program of Teacher Education in Vocational Agriculture for 1970-2000. College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1967.

49. Larson, Milton E. "Review and Synthesis of Research: Analysis for Curriculum Development in Vocational Education." Research Series No. 46, VT No. 010138, ERIC Clearinghouse, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1969.

50. Scargorough, C. C. "Vocational Agriculture in the Changing Scene." Vocational Agriculture in The Changing South Proceedings. Agricultural Policy Institute, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, October, 1969.

THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

51. Jabro, Salim Hanna. "Curricula in Agricultural Education at the Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities in the United States." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Iowa State University, Ames, 1962.

52. Reed, Dale F. "Professional Problems Encountered by Vocational Agriculture Teachers in Louisiana and Implications for Teacher Preparation, Adjustment and Retention." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, 1969.

53. Stewart, Alfred. "The Emerging Role of the Teacher of Vocational Agriculture." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, 1969.

54. Williams, Raiford. "Development of a Two-Year Curriculum in Agricultural Chemical Technology for the Wharton County Junior College, Wharton, Texas." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Missouri, Columbia, 1968.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL

Box 6155, SFA Station
Nacogdoches, Texas
August 4, 1970

(Addressed to 16 State Supervisors of Vocational Agriculture)

Under today's outlook, the expanding role of the vocational agricultural teacher has profound implications on the responsibility that the teacher educator should assume in the pre-service preparation of the teacher. It is clear that future teachers of vocational agriculture will need training different from that now offered. To help with needed curriculum changes, a study is being conducted to determine "Emerging Concepts of Pre-Service Teacher Education in Agricultural Education." The research originated while I was employed by Louisiana State University in the Department of Agricultural Education. While currently a member of the Agricultural Education Staff at Stephen F. Austin State University, I have returned to L.S.U. to complete the study.

As a state official with responsibilities for programs of vocational education in agriculture, you can be of great help by providing the names of individuals in your state who can best supply information for the study. In addition to state supervisors, participants will include teacher educators in agriculture, vocational agriculture teachers, principals and superintendents of public schools.

Enclosed is a form for recording the names and addresses of individuals from your state representing the various groups of participants. Your assistance in supplying me with this information is necessary to make the study. Please complete the attached form as indicated and return to me in the encolsed envelope. A summary of the study will likewise be sent to you upon request.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

R. R. Martin
Asst. Prof. of Agriculture

RRM:seb
Enclosure

EMERGING CONCEPTS OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Please record the names and addresses of 24 individuals from your state representing each of the groups listed below. Thank you for your help.

GROUP	NAME	ADDRESS
Vo. Ag. Teachers		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
Principals		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
Superintendents		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
Supervisors of Vocational Agriculture		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

APPENDIX B

Box 6155, SFA Station
Nacogdoches, Texas
September 10, 1970

TO: (Individually addressed to jury for validation of questionnaire)

FROM: Robert R. Martin, Assistant Professor
Vocational Agricultural Education Department
Stephen F. Austin State University

Dear

To determine "Emerging Concepts of Teacher Education in Agriculture," a study is being conducted in the Vocational Agricultural Education Department at Louisiana State University. As a leader with responsibilities for programs of vocational education in agriculture, you can be of great help by assisting in validating the survey instrument that has been prepared.

Please take a few minutes and give me your comments, if any, concerning the following:

1. Clarity of role activities

2. Coverage of role items

Your frank appraisal and suggestions of emerging concepts that may have been omitted will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Robert R. Martin

RRM/seb

Enclosures: 2

October 16, 1970
Box 6155
Stephen F. Austin Station
Nacogdoches, Texas 75961

TO: (Individually addressed to participants representing the five professional education groups)

FROM: Robert R. Martin, Assistant Professor
Vocational Agricultural Education Department
Stephen F. Austin State University

To determine "Emerging Concepts of Teacher Education in Agriculture," A study is being conducted in the Vocational Agricultural Education Department at Louisiana State University. The changing role of today's vocational agriculture teacher clearly points to the realization that future teachers will need training different from that considered traditional.

As officials and teachers with responsibilities for programs of vocational education in agriculture, you can be of great help in supplying the information for the study. Your cooperation in this undertaking will be appreciated. It is hoped that the results will benefit all of us in initiating needed changes in agricultural education programs.

Please make your evaluation and return to me in the enclosed envelope. Complete returns are necessary! The results of the study will be shared with you upon request.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Robert R. Martin

RRM:lap

Enclosure

November 6, 1970
Box 6155
Stephen F. Austin Station
Nacogdoches, Texas 75961

TO: (Individually addressed to participants who had not responded as of above date)

FROM: Robert R. Martin, Assistant Professor
Vocational Agricultural Education Department
Stephen F. Austin State University

This is a follow-up on the evaluation request mailed to you three weeks ago.

I shall be most appreciative if you would cooperate in completing the enclosed instrument and returning it within two weeks. This is a nationwide study being conducted by the Vocational Agricultural Education Department at Louisiana State University, and your participation is genuinely encouraged.

The initial request was mailed during one of the busiest times of the year; however, I hope that you will now be able to make your evaluation within the next two weeks.

Thank you for your participation. If you have returned the original request, please disregard this letter.

Sincerely,

Robert R. Martin

RRM:lap

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

EMERGING CONCEPTS OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE

Completed form to be mailed first class in the enclosed envelope to:

Robert R. Martin
Box 6155
Stephen F. Austin Station
Nacogdoches, Texas 75961

Name of Respondent_____

Address_____

Title of Position_____

Date_____

Do you want a summary of this study? Yes_____ No_____

INTRODUCTION

The intent of this research is to determine concepts of the emerging role of teacher education in agriculture. It consists of role items and activities of the pre-service training program in agricultural education, related programs and assessments of first-year teaching. A weighted scale is offered for the response that best describes the concept you hold for each activity. Additional space is provided following the activities of each role item for your suggestions or comments.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please evaluate the following items in view of your concepts of teacher education in agriculture, using the rating scale below. In the space provided at the bottom of each group of activities, list the suggestions or comments you wish concerning each of the groups.

EVALUATION SCALE

5 - Very Important

4 - Important

3 - Little Importance

2 - No Value

0 - Undecided

I. PRE-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Role Items and Activities

A. Selection and Recruitment of Candidates

1. Conduct recruitment program in high schools and community colleges within limitations of state and institution regulations . . . . . ( )

2. Identify student with agricultural education curriculum at freshman academic level. . . . . ( )

3. Require practical agricultural experience for entry into agricultural education curriculum . . . . . ( )

4. Require farm experience for entry into agricultural education curriculum. . . . . ( )

5. Require experience in high school vocational agriculture for entry into agricultural education curriculum ( )

6. Require grade or quality point average for entry into advanced agricultural education curriculum. . . . . ( )

7. Require aptitude and/or achievement test scores for entry into agricultural education curriculum. . . . . ( )

8. Require conformity to general appearance and personal habits for entry into agricultural education curriculum . ( )

9. Provide pre-service training for qualified individuals of both sexes . . . . . ( )

10. Counsel individual with disability that would prevent normal performance of duties as a vocational agriculture teacher . . . . . ( )

11. Provide orientation to program by appropriate staff member for entry into agricultural education curriculum . ( )

12. Furnish occupational information such as need for graduates, opportunity for advancement, requirements for entry and certification to high school graduates and community and junior college students . . . . . ( )

13. Develop positive working relationships with guidance counselors, teachers in elementary and junior high schools and agricultural business personnel . . . . . ( )

14. Undertake studies to identify potentially outstanding prospects for the teacher training program. . . . . ( )

15. Provide grants or scholarships to trainees who are deserving . . . . . ( )

Suggestions or Comments:

B. Curriculum

General Education

16. Require the same general education courses for all students preparing to teach . . . . . ( )

17. Provide list of alternative courses from which agricultural education students could choose in the areas of communication, social science and humanities . . . . . ( )

18. Remove the requirement of health and physical education and/or military science . . . . . ( )

19. Require pre-service preparation in communications other than English composition and literature . . . . . ( )

20. Require prospective teachers to demonstrate competency in the area of general education preparation. . . ( )

21. Provide pre-service training in general economics . . . . ( )

22. Provide training in rural sociology . . . . . ( )

23. Require English proficiency test. . . . . ( )

Suggestions or Comments:

Technical Agriculture

24. Develop responsibility for the preparation of high school students in areas not traditionally recognized as as agriculture. . . . . ( )

25. Emphasize pre-service training geared to production agriculture . . . . . ( )

26. Develop ability to understand importance of training in career information and choice at elementary and junior high levels. . . . . ( )

27. Combine and intensify related courses to allow for additional courses in the curriculum. . . . . ( )

28. Update teacher preparation in training for farming to more adequately meet current demands . . . . . ( )

29. Prepare students in the field of agribusiness - its nature, scope, importance and relationship to the general economy . . . . . ( )

30. Develop ability to identify occupational opportunities that exist in the agribusiness field. . . . . ( )

31. Modify existing curricula offerings to include pre-service agribusiness training . . . . . ( )

32. Develop cooperative training in agribusiness involving the institution and business. . . . . ( )

33. Provide course offerings in agribusiness taught by agricultural education faculty. . . . . ( )

34. Provide course offerings in agribusiness taught by agricultural economics faculty. . . . . ( )

35. Develop new teaching materials for use in agri-business training . . . . . ( )

36. Provide job-analysis training related to principles and procedures in agribusiness. . . . . ( )

37. Provide agribusiness internship in specialization area or area of choice . . . . . ( )

38. Provide for resource personnel in off-farm agricultural occupations . . . . . ( )

Suggestions or Comments:

Professional Education

39. Provide training experiences in professional preparation at off-campus centers, under supervision of university staff . . . . . ( )

40. Place all vocational students in job related vocational courses . . . . . ( )

41. Require job related occupational experiences or demonstrated competence of prospective teachers of vocational agriculture prior to certification . . . . . ( )

42. Provide training in sociology of education. . . . . ( )

43. Provide training in psychology of education. . . . . ( )

44. Provide training for preparation of teaching materials. . ( )

45. Provide training in philosophy of education . . . . . ( )

46. Provide training in history of education. . . . . ( )

47. Provide training in methods of teaching . . . . . ( )

48. Provide training in principles and practices in general education . . . . . ( )

49. Promote constant modification of teaching materials and techniques. . . . . ( )

50. Provide training for integration of curriculum content. . ( )

51. Provide training for cooperation with teachers of communications, salesmanship, human relations, science and others for a more coordinated teaching effort at the high school level . . . . . ( )

52. Develop skills in the function of research in today's agricultural field. . . . . ( )

53. Bring university and secondary school personnel together for more effective programs in teacher preparation . . . . . ( )

54. Develop skills in procedures that are clinically and case-study oriented . . . . . ( )

55. Develop ability to conduct small group and individualized instruction. . . . . ( )

56. Introduce the concept of differentiated teaching roles. . ( )

57. Provide training on classroom and non-classroom teaching behavior. . . . . ( )

58. Provide training in vocational guidance principles. . . . ( )

59. Provide pre-service training in preparation for judging contests. . . . . ( )

60. Train students for directing the occupational development process. . . . . ( )

61. Develop ability to provide adult and young farmer instruction . . . . . ( )

62. Develop ability to aid in establishing boys in farming. . ( )

Suggestions or Comments:

C. Program Flexibility

63. Emphasize importance of training workers at all levels of competence. . . . . ( )

64. Develop ability of prospective teachers to provide curriculum to meet the needs of a wide variety of students in a class . . . . . ( )

65. Provide training for educational personnel such as cooperative extension workers and workers on foreign assignments . . . . . ( )

66. Provide training in FFA sponsored contests. . . . . ( )

67. Provide sufficient free elective credits to allow for more specialized training in the pre-service program for those desiring it . . . . . ( )

68. Provide training for prospective teachers in adult classes for persons engaged in farming and agricultural business to help them adjust to changing technology, new products, new methods and current needs of people . . . . ( )

69. Provide additional course work at the pre-service level for preparing prospective teachers to work with disadvantaged students. . . . . ( )

70. Develop ability to recognize peculiar problems of students of different ethnic and social groups. . . . . ( )

71. Conduct special invitational institutes, workshops and conferences involving opinion leaders among vocational agricultural teachers . . . . . ( )

72. Provide in-school student teaching experiences in disadvantaged areas . . . . . ( )

73. Develop internships which will provide appropriate experiences for teaching the disadvantaged. . . . . ( )

74. Support the premise that vocational education is the logical and proper vehicle to move the disadvantaged into the mainstream of life . . . . . ( )

75. Require observation of in-service setting prior to and following student teaching. . . . . ( )

Suggestions or Comments:

D. Student Teaching and Professional Internship

76. Conduct pre-student teaching training sessions individually and collectively . . . . . ( )

77. Provide student teaching experiences for all agricultural education majors to be conducted in public high schools. . . . . ( )

78. Place students with definite occupational objectives in areas that will complement their objectives. . . . . ( )

79. Provide cooperative off-campus student teaching centers involving educational institutions, business and industry supervisory personnel. . . . . ( )

80. Provide substantial remuneration for efforts of critic or supervising teachers. . . . . ( )

81. Provide for student teaching seminars . . . . . ( )

82. Provide training in team and "cooperative" teaching techniques. . . . . ( )

83. Provide experience with continuing education programs . . ( )

Suggestions or Comments:

E. Job Placement

84. Rely on institution placement service . . . . . ( )

85. Provide training on expected and acceptable employment procedures and practices. . . . . ( )

86. Encourage prospective graduates to develop personal data sheet for employment purposes. . . . . ( )

87. Provide help in placement of graduates by staff members in agricultural education . . . . . ( )

88. Provide periodic listing of teaching vacancies through teachers, principals and superintendents. . . . . ( )

89. Provide prospective employers with the aspects of agriculture the graduate is most qualified to teach . . . ( )

90. Encourage use of employment agency contracts. . . . . ( )

Suggestions or Comments:

II. RELATED PROGRAMS

A. Organizations

91. Provide training on importance of youth organizations and activities. . . . . ( )

92. Maintain traditional future farmer organization . . . . . ( )

93. Encourage movement toward modification of the FFA to a more comprehensive agricultural organization . . . . ( )

94. Promote increased participation in collegiate organizations and activities. . . . . ( )

95. Provide information concerning the importance of professional organizations to workers in the field. . . . ( )

96. Provide for use of professional organizations as "partners" in teacher education . . . . . ( )

Suggestions or Comments:

B. State Programs and Certification

97. Continue traditional and current general pattern of certification to teach vocational agriculture under state laws. . . . . ( )

98. Require prospective graduates to demonstrate competencies required for entry into the profession, rather than certification based on prescribed course credits. . . . . ( )

99. Consider certification of qualified persons in business and industry for teaching in specialized areas without traditional preparation as now required . . ( )

100. Require satisfactory performance on national teacher examination for certification . . . . . ( )

101. Upgrade agricultural teachers with special or provisional certificates for eventual certification and professional growth . . . . . ( )

102. Provide in state programs for continuing funds for the kinds of training not provided by the institution for preparation of other teachers, such as non-credit in-service programs, internships for graduates and development of instructional materials. . . . . ( )

103. Provide for annual review of budgets and activities by university and state staffs for modification in terms of current needs . . . . . ( )

104. Encourage increased supervisory contact with vocational agricultural teachers by area or district supervisor . . . . . ( )

105. Provide itinerant teacher trainer to assist teachers on the job. . . . . ( )

106. Provide teacher educator with specialty in technical subject matter to assist teachers on the job. . . . . ( )

107. Provide teacher educator with training and experience to assist local school personnel in planning the program in vocational agriculture . . . . . ( )

Suggestions or Comments:

C. Cooperating Personnel and Agencies

108. Provide opportunity for pre-service professional staff to participate in research. . . . . ( )

109. Provide individual pre-service training for students desiring training for work other than teaching. . . . . ( )

110. Establish a cooperative program with agricultural extension and federal agency personnel. . . . . ( )

111. Develop ability to recognize the value of complementary relationships with agencies and personnel involved in or related to the agricultural complex. . . . . ( )

Suggestions or Comments:

III. ASSESSMENT OF FIRST YEAR TEACHING

112. Conduct prescribed program for first year graduates as a basis of evaluating the pre-service program. . . . . ( )

113. Conduct planned periodic visitation by Ag. Ed. staff of first year graduates while on the job. . . . . ( )

114. Provide for immediate supervision of first year graduates by other than Ag. Ed. staff . . . . . ( )

115. Provide fifth year work as internship in a five-year pre-service program . . . . . ( )

Suggestions or Comments:

COMMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS TO SURVEY INSTRUMENT

(Numbers which are omitted received no comment)

I. Pre-Service Training Program

A. Selection and Recruitment of Candidates

2. Identify student with agricultural education curriculum at freshman academic level.

a. Teacher Educators

--This is extremely important.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Identify at junior level.

c. Supervisors

--Ag. Ed. curriculum should extend into freshman and sophomore years.

3. Require practical agricultural experience for entry into agricultural education curriculum.

a. Teacher Educators

--Experience may be required before graduation.

--Work experience in agribusiness might be useful as a substitute for farm experience.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Without a good background the beginner is at a disadvantage.

c. Supervisors

--Keep the door open to all.

--Require some form of agricultural experience.

--This is an absolute must.

--It helps but should not be required.

--If students have not gained some practical agricultural experience either in high school or before, then they should receive practical experience through the agricultural education curriculum.

d. Principals

--Require experience before certification.

4. Require farm experience for entry into agricultural education curriculum.

a. Teacher Educators

--Require farm production and management.

--To require this is not realistic today.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Very important for production farming or agribusiness.

--This would be helpful, but should not be required.

--Depends on candidates desired area of concentration, i.e. it would not be as important for a teacher of conservation and forestry.

--A student should definitely have experience in the area of agriculture which he intends to teach, but not necessarily in farming.

c. Supervisors

--Require for those teaching production agriculture.

--If student will be teaching production agriculture, this is very important--if he will be teaching an Ag. related area, less importance would be attached.

--In the case of two persons with equal qualifications--the one with farm experience will be the better teacher.

--Production agricultural teachers should come from the farm.

5. Require experience in high school vocational agriculture for entry into agricultural education curriculum.

a. Teacher Educators

--This would be helpful, but is not to be required.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--This is helpful to a teacher, but not a must. He has better understanding of the total program.

--Should be required if they come from a school that offers vocational agriculture.

--This would be nice, but not always possible. It sure helps an individual in understanding the program and how it works if he has had past experience himself.

--Important, but with a good background this could be overlooked.

c. Supervisors

--Good to have, but should not be required.

--Desirable, but not an absolute requirement.

--Important where the high school offering applies to the goals of the student.

d. Principals

--The program should be open to anyone interested in it.

6. Require grade or quality point average for entry into advanced agricultural education curriculum.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--This would be a valuable screening device.

c. Supervisors

--We are getting too many Ag. teachers that are not sold on the program. We need better selection methods.

7. Require aptitude and/or achievement test scores for entry into agricultural education curriculum.

c. Supervisors

--Use as a guide--not a screening tool.

8. Require conformity to general appearance and personal habits for entry into agricultural education curriculum.

a. Teacher Educators

--Do you want a law suit?

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--This would depend on who is doing the evaluation.

9. Provide pre-service training for qualified individuals of both sexes.

c. Supervisors

--For men only.

10. Counsel individual with disability that would prevent normal performance of duties as a vocational agriculture teacher.

a. Teacher Educators

--Counsel him/her out of Ag. Ed.

--Obviously this should be done.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--The student should understand all of the duties expected of a teacher of agriculture.

--Would not use at all.

12. Furnish occupational information such as need for graduates, opportunity for advancement, requirements for entry, and certification to high school graduates and community and junior college students.

a. Teacher Educators

--This is extremely important.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Important to furnish out-of-state information.

--Tell prospective teachers the truth about their profession, such as opportunities, salary advancement, and so forth.

e. Superintendents

--Be objective in representing actual facts. In my judgment, this information has been too generalized in the past and has not given a perspective overview of Ag. occupations in relation to other business and industry. Outside sales and engineering, the potential income available is quite limited in the Ag. occupations area.

13. Develop positive working relationship with guidance counselors, teachers in elementary and junior high schools and agricultural business personnel.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--This is a key point.

c. Supervisors

--A big order, but very important to today's program.

14. Undertake studies to identify potentially outstanding prospects for the teacher training program.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--A very important item, as we vocational teachers are probably involved more in this area than any other instructor.

--Candidates are the product of two types of situations. 1 - An outstanding high school teacher who is able to instill a concept of glorious service in Ag. Ed. in the student. 2 - A very poor high school teacher whose students know they can do a better job.

15. Provide grants or scholarships to trainees who are deserving.

a. Teacher Educators

--Most of our students work part-time to pay their way.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Students should have a financial need.

--We are lacking in the area of scholarships available for those deserving students going into Ag. Ed.

General Comments

c. Supervisors

--Teachers themselves, by their example, will do more to influence their students to enter Ag. Ed. We need students who have the desire to work, influence and assist students to become successful citizens.

--A well-defined program emphasizing the future teaching of Vo. Ag. will not require recruitment. If the product is good, people will come to it.

e. Superintendents

--Guidance counselors should have training and a background in agricultural opportunities in the field of foods and fibers.

B. Curriculum

General Education

16. Require the same general education courses for all students preparing to teach.

a. Teacher Educators

--We are getting to the point of requiring too much general education and cutting short the subject matter areas.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Not of value--need more vocational courses.

--No. Let them specialize, but must meet state requirements.

c. Supervisors

--Some courses in general education are appropriate. We should, however, continue to require some education courses designed to prepare persons to teach effectively in a specific area of vocational education.

18. Remove the requirement of health and physical education and/or military science.

a. Teacher Educators

--Health and military science, no: Physical education, yes.

--Both are important. The Ag. Ed. department should steer clear of pressure to delete either. Activity, if any, should be to provide suggestion for coordination and improvement of such courses.

--Want your kid taught by a sick teacher?

--Follow university requirements only

--Military science should be voluntary

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Should be left up to the individual student

--Should be left in curriculum

c. Supervisors

--Military science already optional (Albany, N. Y.)

--Keep physical education requirement

--These things are needed by all teachers. Military training is good for all including the hippies.

--Do not remove

19. Require pre-service preparation in communications other than English composition and literature.

a. Teacher Educators

--Speech should be required

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Journalism, radio and t.v. should receive consideration

--Student's morals, political views, and dress should be considered. Public relations and communications media are very important today. Should be a part of pre-service training

e. Superintendents

--Speech and public speaking are important to ag. teachers

20. Require prospective teachers to demonstrate competency in the area of general education preparation.

a. Teacher Educators

--This should be done through course work

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Require in-service training before actual job placement

--Don't overdo it here. Remember this is Vo. Ed. In this section, keep in mind that we are dealing with Vo. Ed. and learn by doing method can never be surpassed for effectiveness in teaching vocational competencies.

--I feel that in California, too much time is wasted on so called professional education courses.

--A broadening education is the basic of all college training; Vo. Ed. are not different breed but are still human and should not be channelled into an ever narrowing curriculum.

c. Supervisors

--The basic principles of General Education can be incorporated into the agricultural education courses

e. Superintendents

--Agricultural teachers, as all other teachers, should have a solid general education as a basis to cope with the varied and complex challenges that are part of today's society

21. Provide pre-service training in general economics.

a. Teacher Educators

--At least one course should be required

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--I question the value--more ag. marketing

c. Supervisors

--Should be applied to general agricultural situation and specifically to industry of agriculture

--Agricultural economics usually includes general economic principles

22. Provide training in rural sociology.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--If they have a farm or agricultural background

d. Principals

--or other sociology--many agricultural programs are now found in urban areas

23. Require English proficiency test.

a. Teacher Educators

--Can be done without test

--Not over and above courses required, except public speaking

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Why English? Why not history, math, etc?

--We are not English teachers, but shop!

c. Supervisors

--Only if the student does not have the adequate English requirement

--English proficiency does not prove effectiveness

General Comments

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--More shop work should be required

c. Supervisors

--A great deal of general education could be eliminated for more technical agriculture

--General education courses do not stand alone, but are a part of the total preparation. The student should be taught to regard them as such. The courses themselves need to be made more relative to actual classroom performance

Technical Agriculture

25. Emphasize pre-service training geared to production agriculture.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Some technical knowledge for production is necessary but most jobs are found in agribusiness

--Give student something he can use when he goes out; he must know horticulture, shop, mechanics, and others

--I feel we must change our curriculum from the production farming standpoint to more emphasis on off-farm agricultural occupations.

--Production agriculture is still heart of program, but other areas such as agribusiness should be emphasized

c. Supervisors

--Depends on where you plan to teach

--Lets think in terms of total agriculture--not in terms of its parts

27. Combine and intensify related courses to allow for additional courses in the curriculum.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--It's just a matter of how much you can get while in college

--As much as realistically possible should be included

c. Supervisors

--Basic technical agricultural courses with about 40% of the total hours required be in the specialized area of teaching--agribusiness, service, forestry, horticulture, etc.

28. Update teacher preparation in training for farming to more adequately meet current demands.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--This is no way to even attempt to keep up

--Update, yes; but keep this part in proportion to agribusiness

d. Principals

--Agriculture is more--much more than farming--or hadn't you heard?

29. Prepare students in the field of agribusiness--its nature, scope, importance and relationship to the general economy.

a. Teacher Educators

--Also include horticulture, agricultural equipment, conservation, etc.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--We need much emphasis here.

--Many teachers, including myself, are not as familiar with the area of agribusiness as they should be

--The vocational agricultural teacher should not be expected to know all about everything. Knowing where to get help and what is available is more important

e. Superintendents

--Only if interested in this phase

--This area of agribusiness is lacking and if agriculture education does not develop better and more comprehensive programs , agriculture education will not exist in 20 years--only vocational education

30. Develop ability to identify occupational opportunities that exist in the agribusiness field.

c. Supervisors

--Teach them where to find information of this type

31. Modify existing curricula offerings to include pre-service agribusiness training.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Develop courses of study for agribusiness. Develop list of business principles needed

c. Supervisors

--Give more farm mechanics training in areas that will be needed on the job

d. Principals

--Many of our ag ed students are not from the large farm as in previous years. Agribusiness is the outlet for most of your youngsters in this program

32. Develop cooperative training in agribusiness involving the institution and business.

a. Teacher Educators

--Extremely important to today's program

c. Supervisors

--This is a winner

33. Provide course offerings in agribusiness taught by agricultural education faculty.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Course offerings in agribusiness taught by industry representatives, coordinated by either ag. ed. or ag. economics faculty

--May be taught by any one that understands our teaching needs

--Depends on quality of staff--should have agribusiness experience

c. Supervisors

--Should be provided by the individuals most qualified to do the job regardless of the department

--If the ag. ed. department has qualified personnel, fine, as they know the problems. If personnel is not in ag. ed. department, the economics department should train

--My experience with ag. ed. teacher educators is that they are terribly out of date

d. Principals

--Might be better taught by team--those in agriculture and those in business

e. Superintendents

--The offering of courses in agribusiness is more important than who teaches it

34. Provide course offerings in agribusiness taught by agricultural economics faculty.

a. Teacher Educators

--Provide courses taught by businessmen in specialized areas

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Depends on staff--should be qualified

c. Supervisors

--Training should be provided by most qualified individuals regardless of the department

36. Provide job-analysis training related to principles and procedures in agribusiness.

c. Supervisors

--Too much time is being spent on "how" to teach, rather than "what" to teach

37. Provide agribusiness internship in specialization area or area of choice.

a. Teacher Educators

--This is extremely important

c. Supervisors

--I feel this is ideal

d. Principals

--When at all possible

38. Provide for resource personnel in off-farm agricultural occupations

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--We need subject matter specialists in agribusiness

c. Supervisors

--Do not limit off-farm to agribusiness: Include such areas as conservation which may involve service but not business

--Extremely important

Professional Education

39. Provide training experiences in professional preparation at off-campus centers, under supervision of university staff.

a. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Very necessary

--They have too much supervision from university staff now

--Only if university must be involved

c. Supervisors

--Needed for interim certified teachers

--Impractical in small states. A good department with a good teacher in a good school is the best deal for practice teaching

--Would be good for teachers already assigned

41. Require job related occupational experiences or demonstrated competence of prospective teachers of vocational agriculture prior to certification.

a. Teacher Educators

--Only within specialization area

c. Supervisors

--Internship in farm business could be a fine thing in teacher education programs

--Some training is necessary. Most students should begin teaching when 23 years old. It is unnecessary to make the ag. ed. curriculum a six year course

42. Provide training in sociology of education.

c. Supervisors

--Yes, and better quality with more practical application than is usual is needed

45. Provide training in philosophy of education.

c. Supervisors

--Should not be too extensive

47. Provide training in methods of teaching.

c. Supervisors

--Yes, but only if practical, applied, and by a good professor

49. Promote constant modification of teaching materials and techniques.

c. Supervisors

--Yes, but not change for the sake of change--keep the good old; add the good new

51. Provide training for cooperation with teachers of communications, salesmanship, human relations, science and others for a more coordinated teaching effort at the high school level.

a. Teacher Educators

--Of course, but not at expense of ag. ed.

c. Supervisors

--Fine, if possible

--We need a cooperative effort to make vo. ag. a part of the total educational program--not to set it apart

52. Develop skills in the function of research in today's agricultural field.

a. Teacher Educators

--This is extremely important

--This can't be done

c. Supervisors

--Not for high school teachers

53. Bring university and secondary school personnel together for more effective programs in teacher preparation.

e. Superintendents

--Prepare ag. teachers to teach a minor field or other common subjects. Not all schools support a full time program but the ag. teacher could help in general education and carry a full load

58. Provide training in vocational guidance principles.

a. Teacher Educators

--This can't be done

--Yes, but be sure it is vocational

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--I feel that most high schools are missing a prime ingredient of education by not supplying vocational guidance to most students

c. Supervisors

--No special introduction to guidance is normally needed for an agricultural teacher

59. Provide pre-service training in preparation for judging contest.

c. Supervisors

--A minimum amount of training in the pre-service program

61. Develop ability to aid in establishing boys in farming.

a. Teacher Educators

--Extremely important in appropriate areas

--Yes, and in other agricultural occupations

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Would not apply to many vo. ag. programs that do not offer production ag.

c. Supervisors

--Yes, and/or in career occupations

--To the extent a need exists for persons to make farming their life's occupation

--Boys and girls

e. Superintendents

--Good idea, but availability of financing and land are prime considerations

General Comments

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--The pre-service preparation should provide training in how to be an organized teacher

c. Supervisors

--Let's not spread ourselves too thin. We can't be everything to everybody

--Most items in the above section are quite important, but impossible to treat adequately in a 4 year program

d. Principals

--Assist all potential vo-ag teachers in learning all they can about the FFA before they get a chapter of their own

C. Program Flexibility

63. Emphasize importance of training workers at all levels of competence.

c. Supervisors

--Should be entry level

64. Develop ability of prospective teachers to provide curriculum to meet the needs of a wide variety of students in a class.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--This is very important because many of our students do not come from farms, but are interested in the agricultural field

--Teachers in high school can't effectively do this so why train them for it?

65. Provide training for educational personnel such as cooperative extension workers and workers on foreign assignments.

a. Teacher Educators

--If university requests it

c. Supervisors

--Provide, but not require

66. Provide training in FFA sponsored contests.

a. Teacher Educators

--This leads to inflexibility

67. Provide sufficient free elective credits to allow for more specialized training in the pre-service program for those desiring it.

a. Teacher Educators

--Extremely important

68. Provide training for prospective teachers in adult classes for persons engaged in farming and agricultural business to help them adjust to changing technology, new products, new methods and current needs of people.

d. Principals

--This would be more important to those working with adults

69. Provide additional course work at the pre-service level for preparing prospective teachers to work with disadvantaged students.

a. Teacher Educators

--If we do our job, we do this

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--To my knowledge, none of this has been done in the field of vo. ag.

--Make available to those that are interested in teaching disadvantaged students

c. Supervisors

--We have promoted much effort in working with disadvantaged and feel our program has much to offer this group

--I'm not sold on this disadvantaged and handicapped "kick" we are going through

--Should be a program in itself

--Some of the better teachers have been doing this for a long time

--Make this an area of its own--not another course in already heavy schedule

70. Develop ability to recognize peculiar problems of students of different ethnic and social groups.

a. Teacher Educators

--Another case of unequal look at problems of teachers. There is a great difference in providing a course and being sure students develop abilities

72. Provide in-school student teaching experiences in disadvantaged areas.

a. Teacher Educators

--May be very difficult

--For those wanting to work in this area

c. Supervisors

--Could discourage teachers from entering profession if required for all

73. Develop internships which will provide appropriate experiences for teaching the disadvantaged.

c. Supervisors

--For those teachers desiring to go into that area of work

d. Principals

--All of us fall into this area at times

74. Support the premise that vocational education is the logical and proper vehicle to move disadvantaged into the mainstream of life.

a. Teacher Educators

--Education for all starts at an early age--even for the disadvantaged

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Not the entire vehicle through which they move

--As long as vocational and disadvantaged do not become synonymous

--We must either teach disadvantaged as a class or leave them to some one else. They take a lot of time

c. Supervisors

--Handicapped and disadvantaged I think will need specialized teachers--and will need extra training and help

--Vocational education is one of the logical and proper vehicles to move disadvantaged into the mainstream of life

--I consider disadvantaged training important in agriculture, but has been working in regular programs for a long time

--Vocational education in one form or another for all, including disadvantaged, into main stream of life

e. Superintendents

--Only one of the vehicles, however

--I am of the opinion that the emphasis should be placed on preparing teachers of agriculture. Perhaps, special training could be provided in addition for those students who wish to work with deprived students

75. Require observation of in-service setting prior to and following student teaching.

a. Teacher Educators

--Observation prior to student teaching is most important: observation after student teaching is less important

c. Supervisors

--I think this would depend on the length of the student teaching period, experiences recurred and many other factors

General Comments

c. Supervisors

--All of these are very important. Question: Should these all be taught at undergraduate level? They will not have an appreciation for many of the above areas until they are actually teaching and experiencing concerns.

D. Student Teaching and Professional Internship

77. Provide student teaching experiences for all agricultural education majors to be conducted in public high schools.

a. Teacher Educators

--Extremely important

--We use either secondary or post secondary institutions, depending on the students objectives

--The more student teaching they can get before graduation the better job they will do, or they will find this is not for them

--Student teaching should be offered also for those preparing for post high school teaching positions

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--I feel that the strongest link in preparing agriculture teachers is the off-campus student teaching assignment

--Might also provide student teaching experiences in public junior colleges if student goal is teaching in Jr. college

--Very important

d. Principals

--And also in other appropriate institutions

78. Place students with definite occupational objectives in areas that will complement their objectives.

e. Superintendents

--Experience should be broad--internship in areas other than occupational objectives

79. Provide cooperative off-campus student teaching centers involving educational institutions, business and industry supervisory personnel.

c. Supervisors

--Off-campus student teaching experience in area of specialization is highly recommended

--This is a worthy objective if properly supervised

80. Provide substantial remuneration for efforts of critic or supervising teachers.

d. Principals

--Establish funds for this

81. Provide for student teaching seminars.

a. Teacher Educators

--Good if distance isn't too much of a factor

82. Provide training in "team" and "cooperative" teaching techniques.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Most vo. ag. teachers are in a one teacher situation at present time

--A good way to teach vo. courses

General Comments

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Too many student teachers I get have too little training in the preparation of a day's lesson

c. Supervisors

--All above are musts

d. Principals

--Please make the above practical for those going into internship. Use all levels of students for these programs

e. Superintendents

--Most of this is being done

E. Job Placement

84. Rely on institution placement service.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--The vocational education department should play the major role in placement, not the placement service or an employment agency. Reason: The vocational education people are closer to the students and know their abilities much better.

--The educational institution is and should be solely responsible for the offering of placement data to all its qualified graduates. It sure beats handed a "hunting license" after all that "valuable" education to do a job.

c. Supervisors

--Use it, but do not rely on it

d. Principals

--It is most helpful, we believe

e. Superintendents

--Depends on the policies of a given university. Job placement for vo. ag. teachers could be handled thru the central placement office, if all professors would cooperate, but often we find a professor who wants to take a direct hand in placing his favorite student

88. Provide periodic listing of teaching vacancies through teachers, principals and superintendents.

a. Teacher Educators

--And, through state dept. of education personnel

--If it fits into the policy

89. Provide prospective employers with the aspects of agriculture the graduate is most qualified to teach.

c. Supervisors

--Only on request

--The teaching center does not always know students

90. Encourage use of employment agency contracts.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Stay away from them

c. Supervisors

--Not used in Arizona for agricultural teachers

--I have found that the incompetent use agency contracts

II. RELATED PROGRAMS

A. Organizations

91. Provide training on importance of youth organization and activities.

c. Supervisors

--Extremely important

92. Maintain traditional future farmer organization.

a. Teacher Educators

--Change is inevitable. Values can be maintained

--Should continue internal revisions in certain ties and policies. Basic concept of leadership development, group planning and activity should be maintained and enhanced

--In the university, no

--Changes needed

b. Vocational Agriculture Teachers

--Should change FFA to meet changing times

--The FFA should be used as a motivation tool by the teacher, it should not receive major emphasis as to teacher time

--Traditional as well as update to new and current items

c. Supervisors

--You don't have to teach too much about FFA. It will take care of itself. We need more knowledgable men in the field of agriculture

--At least its basic structure and goals

--It needs to include provisions for off-farm agriculture as well as production agriculture

--This is a "When are you going to stop beating your mother" question

--Extremely important

--Traditional, no. Youth organization, no. But still important

--With exceptions

d. Principals

--For production students

--Or equivalent organizations appropriate to the local curriculum

--Good instructional program should come first. If this can be done with the traditional FFA--then O.K.

--FFA is a highly honored name; however, very few pupils engaged in an agricultural program regard themselves as future farmers. One of the greater values of the agricultural program comes from experiences in the FFA

--Leadership training a must!

e. Superintendents

--To some extent

93. Encourage movement toward modification of the FFA to a more comprehensive agricultural organization.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--If production agriculture changes the FFA must change

c. Supervisors

--FFA is comprehensive already; perhaps needs a little modification

--This has already happened. (Missouri)

--Youth organization should fill the needs of students--if need dictates change, change should come

e. Superintendents

--FFA is the organization that allows students an outstanding opportunity to develop leadership, poise, character, citizenship and job opportunities for employment in production agriculture and agribusiness

94. Promote increased participation in collegiate organizations and activities.

c. Supervisors

--Extend related work to develop a well-rounded individual

--Promote, but not require

95. Provide information concerning the importance of professional organizations to workers in the field.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Provide training in the importance of professional agriculture over labor unions and the image of the teaching profession

c. Supervisors

--Definitely

B. State Programs and Certification

97. Continue traditional and current general pattern of certification to teach vocational agriculture under state laws.

a. Teacher Educators

--With modifications required for special teachers

--Must, no choice

--In ag. ed., yes; in T & I, no

c. Supervisors

--You have no choice if it is the law. (Springfield, Ill.)

--What are "traditional" and "current" in your state? Ours are poor!

--Needs modification

d. Principals

--Adopt requirements to reflect changes in programs

98. Require prospective graduates to demonstrate competencies required for entry into the profession, rather than certification based on prescribed course credits.

a. Teacher Educators

--We need both

--A combination would be good

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Propose a one year trial basis

c. Supervisors

--Yes, experience in skill field

--Desirable, but highly unlikely

--Required courses should result in development of competence or be eliminated

--This soulds good, but they can beat you in court if they have met certification requirements

99. Consider certification of qualified persons in business and industry for teaching in specialized areas without traditional preparation as now required.

a. Teacher Educators

--Only under supervision of fully qualified teacher

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Should take some teacher method courses, communication, and psychology

c. Supervisors

--It is being done (Missouri)

--Provided they can teach

100. Require satisfactory performance on national teacher examination for certification.

a. Teacher Educators

--Only if required by state

c. Supervisors

--A vo. ag. teacher from New England would be lost in Arizona or California

--Depends on examination

d. Principals

--National tests would be so hard that they are likely to be meaningless

101. Upgrade agricultural teachers with special or provisional certificates for eventual certification and professional growth.

a. Teacher Educators

--Only if necessary

103. Provide for annual review of budgets and activiries by university and state staffs for modification in terms of current needs.

a. Teacher Educators

--Get university budget clear of state staff

c. Supervisors

--Impractical and unlikely here despite close personal ties

--Differs according to state. Suggestions by state staff--this is local option in our state

--Never, this is a distinct responsibility

e. Superintendents

--Utopia!!

104. Encourage increased supervisory contact with vocational agricultural teachers by area or district supervisor.

a. Teacher Educators

--Not our role

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--We are suffering here

c. Supervisors

--Yes, but practice is decreasing nationally

--Let's cut down on paper work so this can be accomplished

e. Superintendents

--Presently being well done

--I resent agricultural teachers going to these supervisors as if they were principals

105. Provide itinerant teacher trainer to assist teachers on the job.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Good idea

c. Supervisors

--This is the supervisors job

--If you can get it funded

106. Provide teacher educator with specialty in technical subject matter to assist teachers on the job.

a. Teacher Educators

--Not from agricultural education staff

c. Supervisors

--State supervisor's role

--For adults only

--Especially needed in ag. mechanics, horticulture and forestry

--I wish we could

e. Superintendents

--Needed in math and research

107. Provide teacher educator with training and experience to assist local school personnel in planning the program in vocational agriculture.

b. Vocational Agriculture Teachers

--Needed on a practical level

c. Supervisors

--More the job of ag. supervisor

--This is basically the job of the state staff

--Supervisors do this, too

d. Principals

--This should be done with needs of community in front--best done with principal, curriculum coordinator, and county coordinator

C. Cooperating Personnel and Agencies

108. Provide opportunity for pre-service professional staff to participate in research.

a. Teacher Educators

--Only on an individual basis

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Teachers must know how to teach and must know what they are teaching, but cut out the fat. Teachers must also be able to get into the other fields.

--A properly trained educator can teach himself: if he has had a good "problem solving" preparation to handle new and different developments in the need of the student. A highly skilled workman no matter how well he does his job is not a teacher

109. Provide individual pre-service training for students desiring training for work other than teaching.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Workshop skills week to upgrade teacher skills

--Teacher training should be just teacher training

c. Supervisors

--Particularly county agents

--Consider dual majors, also

110. Establish a cooperative program with agricultural extension and federal agency personnel.

a. Teacher Educators

--If you can't beat 'em, join 'em

c. Supervisors

--Closed cooperative effort with other agricultural agencies--both state and federal

--Teacher training functions should remain teacher training--they should not lap over into state function

--Well prepared teachers of vo. ag. are well trained for any position

--This would help us

111. Develop ability to recognize the value of complementary relationships with agencies and personnel involved in or related to the agricultural complex.

c. Supervisors

--We will need to certify teachers in specialized fields such as agricultural mechanics in area vocational schools who have a background of successful experience in their field, who desire to teach and have had experience and want to and like to work with young people

III. Assessment of First Year Teaching

112. Conduct prescribed program for first year graduates as a basis of evaluating the pre-service program.

a. Teacher Educators

--The reason is more than this

--Not the main purpose

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--The first year is when you hit the problems and need the help. I think I was a pretty poor teacher the first 2 or 3 years, but mainly because of lack of training

113. Conduct planned periodic visitation by Ag. Ed. Staff of first year graduates while on the job.

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--The first year of teaching is rough and a person should have all the help he can get. Usually local school people do not group the total program of vo. ag. and the teacher could use specialists in the various fields to come in and help out. Such as: shop, FFA activities, etc.

c. Supervisors

--During the first year teaching, the supervision of this new teacher is the responsibility of local school and area supervisor. However, I believe it is possible for ag. ed. state and VA supervisor to cooperate to do this job

d. Principals

--Some of the assessment should be done with the school staff in which the first year graduate is working

e. Superintendents

--Have the visiting ag. ed. staff member check that the work of the ag. teacher is in the proper area for the region. For example our ag. teachers place too much emphasis on animal judging. Most of our people make their living from horticulture

114. Provide for immediate supervision of first year graduates by other than ag. ed. staff.

a. Teacher Educators

--Local school administration must become involved

--Not our role

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--I feel that a new teacher, going into a one man department, needs further guidance and help until he has at least one year teaching experience behind him.

--Develop means of teacher evaluation locally

c. Supervisors

--Cooperating teacher might be used in this case

d. Principals

--Unless by this you mean other college teaching specialists, which may be a good idea on a consultive basis

115. Provide fifth year work as internship in a five-year preservice program.

a. Teacher Educators

--Internship difficult in our situation because of logistics problems. All public school teachers in the state are required to complete a fifth year (i.e. Master's equivalent) within eight years after initial certification. If they fail to do so, they cannot be licensed to teach. (In effect since 1967.) New Mexico State

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--Pay would need to be increased to justify additional year of preparation

--If pay goes up, then perhaps consider a 5 year undergraduate training program

--Depends on program

--Most important one

--We have 5th year pre-requisite to teach ag. ed. in Washington

--If a fair salary is promoted

c. Supervisors

--We have a five year program. (Washington)

--Is this essential if background has been well-established?

--Vo. ag. teaching should be a 4 year curriculum like every other teaching field. By providing more agricultural subjects and combining ed. subjects, a better rounded education can be obtained by graduates

--This would be good, but at present not practical as supply of teachers is very low

--A worthy goal, however we have a shortage of teachers with a 4 year program

General Comments

b. Vocational Agricultural Teachers

--The objective in teacher training should be to help new teachers with methods and to give them subject matter to teach when they take a job. There is quite a lot of "Ivory Tower" in college education curriculum

--How much longer can a small state stay in the business of training vo. ag. teachers?

--There is no doubt that we need to change out teacher education program. The old concept of training for farming--projects, etc. will not meet the needs of young men and women preparing for teachers of agricultural mechanics, horticulture, agribusiness and forestry, etc. Our programs in secondary schools are becoming more and more specialized. Teacher education will need to be also

APPENDIX D

Some explanation is in order with reference to Appendix D, as an effort was made to reduce the bulk of this section. The reader is referred to the survey questionnaire in Appendix B for a listing of the 115 role activities that were used in this study. For the five tables that comprise this appendix, only the numbers of the questionnaire activities will be listed.

TABLE XXVII

A FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATION OF 44 TEACHER EDUCATORS TO THE 115 TEACHER EDUCATION CONCEPTS

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
I. PRE-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM											
A. Selection and Recruitment of Candidates											
1.	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	9.1	18	40.9	22	50.0	4.4
2.	1	2.3	3	6.8	6	13.6	27	61.4	7	15.9	3.8
3.	0	0.0	4	9.1	12	27.3	17	38.6	11	25.0	3.8
4.	0	0.0	9	20.5	21	47.7	12	27.3	2	4.5	3.2
5.	2	4.5	13	29.5	22	50.0	7	15.9	0	0.0	2.7
6.	2	4.5	2	4.5	7	15.9	25	56.8	8	18.2	3.8
7.	3	6.8	10	22.7	26	59.1	5	11.4	0	0.0	2.7
8.	3	6.8	6	13.6	12	27.3	17	38.6	6	13.6	3.3
9.	2	4.5	0	0.0	1	2.3	16	36.4	25	56.8	4.4

(Continued)

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
10	0	0.0	2	4.5	1	2.3	12	27.3	29	65.9	4.5
11	0	0.0	1	2.3	1	2.3	15	34.1	27	61.4	4.5
12	0	0.0	1	2.3	1	2.3	16	36.4	26	59.1	4.5
13	0	0.0	1	2.3	4	9.1	16	36.4	23	52.3	4.4
14	0	0.0	2	4.5	8	18.2	24	54.5	10	22.7	4.0
15	1	2.3	2	4.5	6	13.6	24	54.5	11	25.0	3.9
B. Curriculum General Education											
16	1	2.3	12	27.3	21	47.7	7	15.9	3	6.8	3.0
17	0	0.0	3	6.8	3	6.8	23	52.3	15	34.1	4.1
18	4	9.1	17	38.6	13	29.5	5	11.4	5	11.4	2.7
19	0	0.0	2	4.5	3	6.8	24	54.5	15	34.1	4.2
20	2	4.5	5	11.4	14	31.8	16	36.4	7	15.9	3.4
21	0	0.0	2	4.5	11	25.0	21	47.7	10	22.7	3.9
22	0	0.0	2	4.5	8	18.2	28	63.6	6	13.6	3.9
23	4	9.1	11	25.0	11	25.0	16	36.4	2	4.5	2.9

(Continued)

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
Technical Agriculture											
24	4	9.1	1	2.3	4	9.1	17	38.6	18	40.9	3.9
25	1	2.3	4	9.1	13	29.5	20	45.5	6	13.6	3.6
26	2	4.5	0	0.0	4	9.1	21	47.7	17	38.6	4.1
27	1	2.3	2	4.5	5	11.4	17	38.6	19	43.2	4.1
28	2	4.5	3	6.8	2	4.5	16	36.4	21	47.7	4.1
29	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	27.3	32	72.7	4.7
30	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.5	15	34.1	27	61.4	4.6
31	0	0.0	1	2.3	1	2.3	15	34.1	27	61.4	4.5
32	1	2.3	0	0.0	6	13.6	11	25.0	26	59.1	4.4
33	2	4.5	6	13.6	12	27.3	15	34.1	9	20.5	3.5
34	0	0.0	3	6.8	8	18.2	21	47.7	12	27.3	4.0
35	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.5	20	45.5	22	50.0	4.5
36	0	0.0	1	2.3	3	6.8	22	50.0	18	40.9	4.3

(Continued)

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
37	0	0.0	2	4.5	2	4.5	23	52.3	17	38.6	4.3
38	4	9.1	1	2.3	1	2.3	21	47.7	16	36.4	3.8
Professional Education											
39	3	6.8	1	2.3	3	6.8	6	13.6	31	70.5	4.3
40	9	20.5	2	4.5	8	18.2	13	29.5	12	27.3	3.2
41	2	4.5	1	2.3	3	6.8	22	50.0	16	36.4	4.1
42	3	6.8	3	6.8	13	29.5	20	45.5	5	11.4	3.4
43	1	2.3	1	2.3	4	9.1	21	47.7	17	38.6	4.2
44	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.5	19	43.2	23	52.3	4.5
45	2	4.5	2	4.5	9	20.5	23	52.3	8	18.2	3.7
46	2	4.5	8	18.2	18	40.9	13	29.5	3	6.8	3.1
47	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	7	15.9	36	81.8	4.8
48	1	2.3	2	4.5	15	34.1	18	40.9	8	18.2	3.7
49	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	9.1	11	25.0	29	65.9	4.6

(Continued)

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
50	1	2.3	0	0.0	1	2.3	19	43.2	23	52.3	4.4
51	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.8	18	40.9	23	52.3	4.5
52	1	2.3	2	4.5	13	29.5	23	52.3	5	11.4	3.6
53	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	16	36.4	27	61.4	4.6
54	1	2.3	3	6.8	5	11.4	26	59.1	9	20.5	3.8
55	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	22.7	34	77.3	4.8
56	2	4.5	0	0.0	1	2.3	33	75.0	8	18.2	4.0
57	0	0.0	1	2.3	1	2.3	21	47.7	21	47.7	4.4
58	1	2.3	0	0.0	5	11.4	14	31.8	24	54.5	4.4
59	0	0.0	6	13.6	19	43.2	15	34.1	4	9.1	3.4
60	2	4.5	0	0.0	2	4.5	18	40.9	22	50.0	4.3
61	0	0.0	1	2.3	3	6.8	19	43.2	21	47.7	4.4
62	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	13.6	21	47.7	17	38.6	4.3

(Continued)

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
C. Program Flexibility											
63	1	2.3	1	2.3	3	6.8	20	45.5	19	43.2	4.2
64	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	8	18.2	35	79.5	4.8
65	2	4.5	2	4.5	11	25.0	20	45.5	9	20.5	3.7
66	1	2.3	3	6.8	14	31.8	24	54.5	2	4.5	3.5
67	0	0.0	1	2.3	0	0.0	15	34.1	28	63.6	4.6
68	1	2.3	0	0.0	4	9.1	15	34.1	24	54.5	4.4
69	1	2.3	1	2.3	8	18.2	16	36.4	18	40.9	4.1
70	2	4.5	1	2.3	2	4.5	23	52.3	16	36.4	4.1
71	1	2.3	1	2.3	10	22.7	21	47.7	11	25.0	3.9
72	2	4.5	1	2.3	7	15.9	25	56.8	9	20.5	3.8
73	2	4.5	2	4.5	5	11.4	25	56.8	10	22.7	3.8
74	1	2.3	2	4.5	5	11.4	20	45.5	16	36.4	4.1
75	4	9.1	1	2.3	6	13.6	17	38.6	16	36.4	3.8

(Continued)

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
D. **Student Teaching and Professional Internship**											
76	2	4.5	2	4.5	3	6.8	12	27.3	25	56.8	4.2
77	0	0.0	1	2.3	3	6.8	3	6.8	37	84.1	4.7
78	1	2.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	31.8	29	65.9	4.6
79	3	6.8	0	0.0	2	4.5	18	40.9	21	47.7	4.1
80	0	0.0	1	2.3	9	20.5	18	40.9	16	36.4	4.1
81	1	2.3	0	0.0	3	6.8	18	40.9	22	50.0	4.3
82	1	2.3	0	0.0	6	13.6	18	40.9	19	43.2	4.2
83	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	18	40.9	25	56.8	4.5
E. **Job Placement**											
84	1	2.3	6	13.6	14	31.8	17	38.6	6	13.6	3.5
85	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	11.4	16	36.4	23	52.3	4.4
86	1	2.3	1	2.3	2	4.5	16	36.4	24	54.5	4.4

(Continued)

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
87	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	11	25.0	32	72.7	4.7
88	0	0.0	3	6.8	4	9.1	18	40.9	19	43.2	4.2
89	1	2.3	0	0.0	3	6.8	23	52.3	17	38.6	4.2
90	8	18.2	20	45.5	12	27.3	4	9.1	0	0.0	2.1
II. RELATED PROGRAMS											
A. Organizations											
91	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	17	38.6	26	59.1	4.6
92	2	4.5	10	22.7	17	38.6	13	29.5	2	4.5	3.0
93	2	4.5	0	0.0	4	9.1	10	22.7	28	63.6	4.4
94	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	9.1	28	63.6	12	27.3	4.2
95	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.5	21	47.7	21	47.7	4.4
96	0	0.0	1	2.3	2	4.5	26	59.1	15	34.1	4.3
B. State Programs and Certification											
97	5	11.4	6	13.6	19	43.2	8	18.2	6	13.6	3.0

(Continued)

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
98	3	6.8	9	20.5	3	6.8	13	29.5	16	36.4	3.6
99	5	11.4	5	11.4	6	13.6	18	40.9	10	22.7	3.4
100	6	13.6	24	54.5	13	29.5	1	2.3	0	0.0	2.1
101	4	9.1	1	2.3	6	13.6	22	50.0	11	25.0	3.7
102	4	9.1	3	6.8	3	6.8	17	38.6	17	38.6	3.8
103	5	11.4	2	4.5	2	4.5	20	45.5	15	34.1	3.8
104	1	2.3	3	6.8	0	0.0	16	36.4	24	54.5	4.3
105	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	11.4	12	27.3	27	61.4	4.5
106	3	6.8	4	9.1	7	15.9	14	31.8	16	36.4	3.9
107	1	2.3	0	0.0	4	9.1	15	34.1	24	54.5	4.4
C. Cooperating Personnel and Agencies											
108	1	2.3	1	2.3	5	11.4	16	36.4	21	47.7	4.2
109	5	11.4	10	22.7	7	15.9	13	29.5	9	20.5	3.1

(Continued)

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
110	4	9.1	3	6.8	10	22.7	15	34.1	12	27.3	3.5
111	1	2.3	0	0.0	4	9.1	20	45.5	19	43.2	4.3
III. ASSESSMENT OF FIRST YEAR TEACHING											
112	1	2.3	1	2.3	1	2.3	20	45.5	21	47.7	4.3
113	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	29.5	31	70.5	4.7
114	4	9.1	4	9.1	11	25.0	14	31.8	11	25.0	3.5
115	8	18.2	3	6.8	11	25.0	15	34.1	7	15.9	3.0

TABLE XXVIII

A FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATION OF 95 TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TO THE 115 TEACHER EDUCATION CONCEPTS

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
I. PRE-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM											
A. Selection and Recruitment of Candidates											
1	4	4.2	0	0.0	23	24.2	32	33.7	36	37.9	4.0
2	3	3.2	4	4.2	22	23.2	41	43.2	25	26.3	3.8
3	0	0.0	5	5.3	21	22.1	31	32.6	38	40.0	4.1
4	0	0.0	7	7.4	32	33.7	44	46.3	12	12.6	3.6
5	3	3.2	14	14.7	36	37.9	30	31.6	12	12.6	3.3
6	1	1.1	8	8.4	32	33.7	46	48.4	8	8.4	3.5
7	5	5.3	15	15.8	44	46.3	25	26.3	6	6.3	3.1
8	2	2.1	6	6.3	28	29.5	32	33.7	27	28.4	3.8
9	6	6.3	2	2.1	16	16.8	48	50.5	23	24.2	3.8
10	5	5.3	3	3.2	15	15.8	37	38.9	35	36.8	3.9

(Continued)

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
11	2	2.1	3	3.2	12	12.6	48	50.5	30	31.6	4.0
12	2	2.1	0	0.0	7	7.4	35	36.8	51	53.7	4.4
13	1	1.1	2	2.1	6	6.3	26	27.4	60	63.2	4.5
14	3	3.2	5	5.3	13	13.7	41	43.2	33	34.7	4.0
15	2	2.1	3	3.2	14	14.7	37	38.9	39	41.1	4.1
B. Curriculum General Education											
16	7	7.4	23	24.2	37	38.9	21	22.1	7	7.4	2.9
17	1	1.1	2	2.1	14	14.7	51	53.7	27	28.4	4.1
18	17	17.9	35	36.8	27	28.4	7	7.4	9	9.5	2.4
19	5	5.3	10	10.5	20	21.1	46	48.4	14	14.7	3.5
20	1	1.1	4	4.2	30	31.6	40	42.1	19	20.0	3.7
21	3	3.2	6	6.3	36	37.9	40	42.1	10	10.5	3.5
22	1	1.1	6	6.3	26	27.4	52	54.7	10	10.5	3.7
23	2	2.1	21	22.1	33	34.7	33	34.7	6	6.3	3.2

(Continued)

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
Technical Agriculture											
24	11	11.6	6	6.3	16	16.8	29	30.5	33	34.7	3.6
25	2	2.1	7	7.4	27	28.4	41	43.2	18	18.9	3.7
26	3	3.2	6	6.3	15	15.8	46	48.4	25	26.3	3.9
27	3	3.2	2	2.1	15	15.8	50	52.6	25	26.3	3.9
28	2	2.1	3	3.2	4	4.2	41	43.2	45	47.4	4.3
29	1	1.1	0	0.0	3	3.2	31	32.6	60	63.2	4.6
30	1	1.1	0	0.0	3	3.2	27	28.4	64	67.4	4.6
31	2	2.1	1	1.1	10	10.5	39	41.1	43	45.3	4.2
32	2	2.1	1	1.1	13	13.7	37	38.9	42	44.2	4.2
33	1	1.1	4	4.2	12	12.6	43	45.3	35	36.8	4.1
34	3	3.2	8	8.4	26	27.4	37	38.9	21	22.1	3.7
35	3	3.2	0	0.0	7	7.4	23	24.2	62	65.3	4.5
36	3	3.2	3	3.2	16	16.8	33	34.7	40	42.1	4.1

(Continued)

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
37	3	3.2	0	0.0	24	25.3	35	36.8	32	33.7	3.9
38	2	2.1	0	0.0	15	15.8	35	36.8	43	45.3	4.2
Professional Education											
39	4	4.2	1	1.1	11	11.6	35	36.8	44	46.3	4.2
40	6	6.3	9	9.5	31	32.6	30	31.6	19	20.0	3.4
41	4	4.2	6	6.3	24	25.3	40	42.1	21	22.1	3.7
42	3	3.2	14	14.7	47	49.5	24	25.3	7	7.4	3.2
43	4	4.2	10	10.5	35	36.8	33	34.7	13	13.7	3.4
44	2	2.1	0	0.0	9	9.5	31	32.6	53	55.8	4.4
45	5	5.3	19	20.0	33	34.7	28	29.5	10	10.5	3.1
46	6	6.3	29	30.5	41	43.2	16	16.8	3	3.2	2.7
47	1	1.1	0	0.0	9	9.5	30	31.6	55	57.9	4.4
48	1	1.1	7	7.4	48	50.5	35	36.8	4	4.2	3.3
49	1	1.1	2	2.1	4	4.2	41	43.2	47	49.5	4.4

(Continued)

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
50	6	6.3	0	0.0	15	15.8	48	50.5	26	27.4	3.9
51	1	1.1	1	1.1	15	15.8	43	45.3	35	36.8	4.1
52	3	3.2	4	4.2	29	30.5	43	45.3	16	16.8	3.7
53	0	0.0	2	2.1	7	7.4	37	38.9	49	51.6	4.4
54	15	15.8	11	11.6	28	29.5	30	31.6	11	11.6	3.0
55	2	2.1	0	0.0	11	11.6	36	37.9	46	48.4	4.3
56	9	9.5	5	5.3	24	25.3	38	40.0	19	20.0	3.5
57	1	1.1	2	2.1	18	18.9	37	38.9	37	38.9	4.1
58	1	1.1	1	1.1	15	15.8	42	44.2	36	37.9	4.2
59	1	1.1	12	12.6	27	28.4	36	37.9	19	20.0	3.6
60	5	5.3	1	1.1	34	35.8	37	38.9	18	18.9	3.6
61	4	4.2	1	1.1	15	15.8	29	30.5	46	48.4	4.1
62	0	0.0	3	3.2	27	28.4	33	34.7	32	33.7	4.0

(Continued)

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
C. Program Flexibility											
63	1	1.1	1	1.1	15	15.8	45	47.4	33	34.7	4.1
64	2	2.1	2	2.1	6	6.3	33	34.7	52	54.7	4.4
65	6	6.3	8	8.4	35	36.8	29	30.5	17	17.1	3.4
66	0	0.0	3	3.2	18	18.9	37	38.9	37	38.9	4.1
67	3	3.2	3	3.2	11	11.6	39	41.1	39	41.1	4.1
68	2	2.1	1	1.1	16	16.8	29	30.5	47	49.5	4.2
69	1	1.1	5	5.3	24	25.3	38	40.0	27	28.4	3.9
70	3	3.2	4	4.2	16	16.8	48	50.5	24	25.3	3.9
71	3	3.2	6	6.3	16	16.8	44	46.3	26	27.4	3.9
72	3	3.2	2	2.1	27	28.4	40	42.1	23	24.2	3.8
73	3	3.2	3	3.2	25	26.3	43	45.3	21	22.1	3.8
74	5	5.3	8	8.4	14	14.7	35	36.8	33	34.7	3.8
75	4	4.2	3	3.2	25	26.3	29	30.5	33	34.7	3.8

(Continued)

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
D. Student Teaching and Professional Internship											
76	7	7.4	1	1.1	18	18.9	33	34.7	36	37.9	3.9
77	2	2.1	1	1.1	6	6.3	22	23.2	64	67.4	4.5
78	1	1.1	3	3.2	10	10.5	29	30.5	52	54.7	4.3
79	3	3.2	4	4.2	17	17.9	38	40.0	33	34.7	4.0
80	1	1.1	5	5.3	16	16.8	38	40.0	35	36.8	4.1
81	2	2.1	2	2.1	8	8.4	40	42.1	43	45.3	4.2
82	0	0.0	4	4.2	16	16.8	44	46.3	31	32.6	4.1
83	0	0.0	3	3.2	19	20.0	40	42.1	33	34.7	4.1
E. Job Placement											
84	10	10.5	9	9.5	31	32.6	32	33.7	13	13.7	3.2
85	2	2.1	3	3.2	17	17.9	42	44.2	31	32.6	4.0
86	1	1.1	0	0.0	9	9.5	37	38.9	48	50.5	4.4

(Continued)

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
87	0	0.0	1	1.1	6	6.3	35	36.8	53	55.8	4.5
88	1	1.1	0	0.0	4	4.2	27	28.4	63	66.3	4.6
89	4	4.2	1	1.1	11	11.6	39	41.1	40	42.1	4.1
90	21	22.1	28	29.5	26	27.4	14	14.7	6	6.3	2.3
II. RELATED PROGRAMS											
A. Organizations											
91	2	2.1	2	2.1	6	6.3	32	33.7	53	55.8	4.4
92	2	2.1	3	3.2	14	14.7	23	24.2	53	55.8	4.3
93	6	6.3	16	16.8	20	21.1	17	17.9	36	37.9	3.6
94	2	2.1	4	4.2	18	18.9	46	48.4	25	26.3	3.9
95	3	3.2	3	3.2	9	9.5	40	42.1	40	42.1	4.1
96	6	6.3	2	2.1	14	14.7	40	42.1	33	34.7	4.0
B. State Programs and Certification											
97	8	8.4	2	2.1	19	20.0	38	40.0	28	29.5	3.7

(Continued)

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
98	10	10.5	9	9.5	22	23.2	27	28.4	27	28.4	3.4
99	10	10.5	24	25.3	10	10.5	32	33.7	18	18.9	3.1
100	10	10.5	43	45.3	32	33.7	7	7.4	3	3.2	2.4
101	10	10.5	10	10.5	14	14.7	37	38.9	24	25.3	3.5
102	4	4.2	5	5.3	13	13.7	34	35.8	39	41.1	4.0
103	10	10.5	9	9.5	20	21.1	32	33.7	24	25.3	3.4
104	1	1.1	4	4.2	8	8.4	37	38.9	45	47.4	4.3
105	5	5.3	4	4.2	12	12.6	36	37.9	38	40.0	4.0
106	4	4.2	2	2.1	13	13.7	33	34.7	43	45.3	4.1
107	4	4.2	5	5.3	7	7.4	38	40.0	41	43.2	4.1
C. Cooperating Personnel and Agencies											
108	9	9.5	10	10.5	30	31.6	34	35.8	12	12.6	3.2
109	8	8.4	16	16.8	25	26.3	35	36.8	11	11.6	3.2

(Continued)

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
110	6	6.3	12	12.6	22	23.2	39	41.1	16	16.8	3.4
111	9	9.5	4	4.2	17	17.9	41	43.2	24	25.3	3.6
III. ASSESSMENT OF FIRST YEAR TEACHING											
112	6	6.3	5	5.3	23	24.2	41	43.2	20	21.1	3.6
113	2	2.1	2	2.1	7	7.4	33	34.7	51	53.7	4.3
114	7	7.4	17	17.9	29	30.5	21	22.1	21	22.1	3.3
115	17	17.9	14	14.7	21	22.1	22	23.2	21	22.1	3.0

TABLE XXIX

A FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATION OF 116 SUPERVISORS TO THE 115 TEACHER EDUCATION CONCEPTS

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
I. PRE-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM											
A. Selection and Recruitment of Candidates											
1	4	3.4	4	3.4	12	10.3	47	40.5	50	43.1	4.2
2	3	2.6	5	4.3	20	17.2	57	49.1	30	25.9	3.9
3	4	3.4	8	6.9	23	19.8	50	43.1	31	26.7	3.8
4	6	5.2	19	16.4	45	38.8	33	28.4	13	11.2	3.2
5	6	5.2	18	15.5	47	40.5	44	37.9	1	0.9	3.1
6	6	5.2	10	8.6	43	37.1	50	43.1	7	6.0	3.3
7	7	6.0	17	14.7	44	37.9	43	37.1	5	4.3	3.1
8	4	3.4	10	8.6	27	23.3	51	44.0	24	20.7	3.7
9	7	6.0	10	8.6	16	13.8	52	44.8	31	26.7	3.7
10	2	1.7	3	2.6	14	12.1	56	48.3	41	35.3	4.1

(Continued)

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
11	3	2.6	3	2.6	9	7.8	53	45.7	48	41.4	4.2
12	1	0.9	3	2.6	5	4.3	46	39.7	61	52.6	4.4
13	2	1.7	0	0.0	9	7.8	38	32.8	67	57.8	4.4
14	2	1.7	9	7.8	30	25.9	46	39.7	29	25.0	3.8
15	3	2.6	3	2.6	23	19.8	51	44.0	36	31.0	4.0
B. Curriculum											
General Education											
16	7	6.0	31	26.7	42	36.2	25	21.6	11	9.5	3.0
17	3	2.6	5	4.3	22	19.0	58	50.0	28	24.1	3.9
18	14	12.1	40	34.5	45	38.8	11	9.5	6	5.2	2.5
19	6	5.2	4	3.4	25	21.6	58	50.0	23	19.8	3.7
20	5	4.3	13	11.2	27	23.3	53	45.7	18	15.5	3.5
21	6	5.2	14	12.1	32	27.6	58	50.0	6	5.2	3.3
22	2	1.7	16	13.8	30	25.9	54	46.6	14	12.1	3.5
23	7	6.0	14	12.1	44	37.9	41	35.3	10	8.6	3.2

(Continued)

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
Technical Agriculture											
24	8	6.9	9	7.8	17	14.7	48	41.4	34	29.3	3.7
25	4	3.4	10	8.6	40	34.5	48	41.4	14	12.1	3.5
26	2	1.7	4	3.4	22	19.0	53	45.7	35	30.2	4.0
27	4	3.4	3	2.6	15	12.9	59	50.9	35	30.2	4.0
28	1	0.9	3	2.6	19	16.4	40	34.5	53	45.7	4.2
29	1	0.9	1	0.9	3	2.6	44	37.9	67	57.8	4.6
30	1	0.9	2	1.7	3	2.6	38	32.8	72	62.1	4.5
31	1	0.9	3	2.6	11	9.5	43	37.1	58	50.0	4.3
32	1	0.9	3	2.6	8	6.9	51	44.0	53	45.7	4.3
33	4	3.4	8	6.9	16	13.8	49	42.2	39	33.6	3.9
34	7	6.0	6	5.2	25	21.6	54	46.6	24	20.7	3.6
35	3	2.6	0	0.0	8	6.9	49	42.2	56	48.3	4.3
36	2	1.7	2	1.7	11	9.5	56	48.3	45	38.8	4.2

(Continued)

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
37	3	2.6	4	3.4	16	13.8	53	45.7	40	34.5	4.0
38	1	0.9	3	2.6	8	6.9	48	41.4	56	48.3	4.3
Professional Education											
39	6	5.2	8	6.9	9	7.8	46	39.7	47	40.5	4.0
40	11	9.5	6	5.2	33	28.4	49	42.2	17	14.7	3.4
41	8	6.9	6	5.2	19	16.4	47	40.5	36	31.0	3.8
42	7	6.0	18	15.5	37	31.9	46	39.7	8	6.9	3.2
43	5	4.3	14	12.1	29	25.0	57	49.1	11	9.5	3.4
44	1	0.9	2	1.7	7	6.0	54	46.6	52	44.8	4.3
45	5	4.3	14	12.1	37	31.9	45	38.8	15	12.9	3.4
46	7	6.0	27	23.3	45	38.8	30	25.9	7	6.0	3.0
47	2	1.7	0	0.0	6	5.2	33	28.4	75	64.7	4.5
48	4	3.4	11	9.5	43	37.1	41	35.3	17	14.7	3.4
49	2	1.7	1	0.9	9	7.8	41	35.3	63	54.3	4.4

(Continued)

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
50	2	1.7	3	2.6	14	12.1	54	46.6	43	37.1	4.1
51	3	2.6	3	2.6	13	11.2	49	42.2	48	41.4	4.1
52	7	6.0	9	7.8	38	32.8	48	41.4	14	12.1	3.4
53	4	3.4	2	1.7	12	10.3	40	34.5	58	50.0	4.2
54	14	12.1	11	9.5	36	31.0	46	39.7	9	7.8	3.1
55	2	1.7	0	0.0	5	4.3	52	44.8	57	49.1	4.4
56	5	4.3	6	5.2	25	21.6	53	45.7	27	23.3	3.7
57	5	4.3	0	0.0	21	18.1	52	44.8	38	32.8	4.0
58	1	0.9	1	0.9	8	6.9	57	49.1	49	42.2	4.3
59	4	3.4	10	8.6	45	38.8	41	35.3	16	13.8	3.4
60	4	3.4	2	1.7	22	19.0	51	44.0	37	31.9	4.0
61	2	1.7	4	3.4	10	8.6	44	37.9	56	48.3	4.3
62	12	10.3	6	5.2	16	13.8	42	36.2	40	34.5	3.7

(Continued)

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
C. **Program Flexibility**											
63	3	2.6	2	1.7	8	6.9	55	47.4	48	41.4	4.2
64	1	0.9	2	1.7	4	3.4	41	35.3	68	58.6	4.5
65	8	6.9	20	17.2	37	31.9	31	26.7	20	17.2	3.2
66	2	1.7	7	6.0	22	19.0	54	46.6	31	26.7	3.9
67	1	0.9	2	1.7	15	12.9	49	42.2	49	42.2	4.2
68	2	1.7	3	2.6	9	7.8	50	43.1	52	44.8	4.3
69	2	1.7	4	3.4	24	20.7	51	44.0	35	30.2	4.0
70	3	2.6	0	0.0	22	19.0	50	43.1	41	35.3	4.1
71	3	2.6	5	4.3	24	20.7	50	43.1	34	29.3	3.9
72	4	3.4	4	3.4	23	19.8	54	46.6	31	26.7	3.9
73	4	3.4	5	4.3	29	25.0	48	41.4	30	25.9	3.8
74	8	6.9	3	2.6	13	11.2	52	44.8	40	34.5	3.9
75	13	11.2	4	3.4	21	18.1	40	34.5	38	32.8	3.6

(Continued)

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
D. Student Teaching and Professional Internship											
76	6	5.2	1	0.9	10	8.6	51	44.0	48	41.4	4.1
77	3	2.6	0	0.0	2	1.7	21	18.1	90	77.6	4.7
78	1	0.9	2	1.7	8	6.9	41	35.3	64	55.2	4.4
79	7	6.0	5	4.3	13	11.2	42	36.2	49	42.2	4.0
80	6	5.2	6	5.2	23	19.8	47	40.5	34	29.3	3.8
81	3	2.6	3	2.6	20	17.2	49	42.2	41	35.3	4.0
82	2	1.7	4	3.4	17	14.7	55	47.4	38	32.8	4.0
83	5	4.3	3	2.6	17	14.7	53	45.7	38	32.8	4.0
E. Job Placement											
84	6	5.2	15	12.9	38	32.8	48	41.4	9	7.8	3.3
85	2	1.7	3	2.6	11	9.5	64	55.2	36	31.0	4.1
86	2	1.7	1	0.9	3	2.6	54	46.6	56	48.3	4.4
87	2	1.7	1	0.9	3	2.6	47	40.5	63	54.3	4.4

(Continued)

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
88	2	1.7	4	3.4	12	10.3	45	38.8	53	45.7	4.2
89	2	1.7	2	1.7	4	3.4	48	41.4	60	51.7	4.4
90	18	15.5	46	39.7	30	25.9	18	15.5	4	3.4	2.4
II. RELATED PROGRAMS											
A. Organizations											
91	1	0.9	1	0.9	5	4.3	43	37.1	65	56.0	4.4
92	7	6.0	8	6.9	16	13.8	42	36.2	42	36.2	3.8
93	9	7.8	19	16.4	12	10.3	30	25.9	45	38.8	3.6
94	2	1.7	10	8.6	29	25.0	54	46.6	20	17.2	3.6
95	4	3.4	4	3.4	6	5.2	62	53.4	39	33.6	4.0
96	4	3.4	6	5.2	11	9.5	61	52.6	33	28.4	3.9
B. State Programs and Certification											
97	10	8.6	14	12.1	20	17.2	46	39.7	25	21.6	3.4
98	14	12.1	4	3.4	21	18.1	46	39.7	30	25.9	3.5

(Continued)

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
99	11	9.5	10	8.6	21	18.1	44	37.9	29	25.0	3.5
100	18	15.5	59	50.9	27	23.3	5	4.3	6	5.2	2.1
101	10	8.6	7	6.0	19	16.4	53	45.7	26	22.4	3.6
102	5	4.3	1	0.9	11	9.5	52	44.8	46	39.7	4.1
103	6	5.2	11	9.5	17	14.7	43	37.1	38	32.8	3.8
104	5	4.3	2	1.7	8	6.9	46	39.7	54	46.6	4.2
105	5	4.3	5	4.3	17	14.7	39	33.6	49	42.2	4.0
106	2	1.7	8	6.9	13	11.2	47	40.5	45	38.8	4.0
107	3	2.6	10	8.6	17	14.7	41	35.3	45	38.8	4.0
C. Cooperating Personnel and Agencies											
108	8	6.9	11	9.5	32	27.6	47	40.5	18	15.5	3.4
109	11	9.5	16	13.8	41	35.3	33	28.4	15	12.9	3.1
110	12	10.3	13	11.2	27	23.3	41	35.3	23	19.8	3.3

(Continued)

TABLE XXIX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
111	5	4.3	3	2.6	16	13.8	59	50.9	33	28.4	3.9
III. ASSESSMENT OF FIRST YEAR TEACHING											
112	13	11.2	7	6.0	18	15.5	50	43.1	28	24.1	3.5
113	3	2.6	4	3.4	2	1.7	45	38.8	62	53.4	4.3
114	11	9.5	12	10.3	20	17.2	39	33.6	34	29.3	3.5
115	16	13.8	8	6.9	34	29.3	38	32.8	19	16.4	3.1

TABLE XXX

A FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATION OF 43 PRINCIPALS TO THE 115 TEACHER EDUCATION CONCEPTS

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
I. PRE-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM											
A. Selection and Recruitment of Candidates											
1	3	7.0	1	2.3	14	32.6	19	44.2	6	14.0	3.5
2	2	4.7	2	4.7	18	41.9	18	41.9	3	7.0	3.4
3	1	2.3	5	11.6	14	32.6	12	27.9	11	25.6	3.6
4	1	2.3	5	11.6	20	46.5	10	23.3	7	16.3	3.4
5	1	2.3	5	11.6	22	51.2	10	23.3	5	11.6	3.3
6	1	2.3	1	2.3	18	41.9	17	39.5	6	14.0	3.6
7	3	7.0	3	7.0	16	37.2	19	44.2	2	4.7	3.3
8	0	0.0	6	14.0	11	25.6	20	46.5	6	14.0	3.6
9	4	9.3	4	9.3	12	27.9	17	39.5	6	14.0	3.3
10	3	7.0	1	2.3	6	14.0	17	39.5	16	37.2	3.9

(Continued)

TABLE XXX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
11	0	0.0	1	2.3	3	7.0	26	60.5	13	30.2	4.2
12	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	9.3	16	37.2	23	53.5	4.4
13	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	9.3	19	44.2	20	46.5	4.4
14	2	4.7	0	0.0	4	9.3	26	60.5	11	25.6	4.0
15	0	0.0	2	4.7	2	4.7	21	48.8	18	41.9	4.3
B. Curriculum											
16	1	2.3	5	11.6	17	39.5	14	32.6	6	14.0	3.4
17	1	2.3	1	2.3	9	20.9	22	51.2	10	23.3	3.9
18	6	14.0	18	41.9	14	32.6	3	7.0	2	4.7	2.3
19	0	0.0	5	11.6	12	27.9	18	41.9	8	18.6	3.7
20	0	0.0	1	2.3	7	16.3	27	62.8	8	18.6	4.0
21	1	2.3	0	0.0	10	23.3	25	58.1	7	16.3	3.8
22	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	16.3	24	55.8	12	27.9	4.1
23	0	0.0	3	7.0	11	25.6	23	53.5	6	14.0	3.7

(Continued)

TABLE XXX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
Technical Agriculture											
24	3	7.0	5	11.6	8	18.6	17	39.5	10	23.3	3.5
25	1	2.3	9	20.9	14	32.6	15	34.9	4	9.3	3.3
26	1	2.3	3	7.0	14	32.6	16	37.2	9	20.9	3.7
27	2	4.7	0	0.0	10	23.3	23	53.5	8	18.6	3.8
28	1	2.3	1	2.3	4	9.3	13	30.2	24	55.8	4.3
29	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	17	39.5	25	58.1	4.6
30	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	44.2	24	55.8	4.6
31	1	2.3	0	0.0	5	11.6	19	44.2	18	41.9	4.2
32	1	2.3	0	0.0	4	9.3	18	41.9	20	46.5	4.3
33	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	11.6	18	41.9	20	46.5	4.3
34	1	2.3	1	2.3	5	11.6	28	65.1	8	18.6	4.0
35	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	7.0	18	41.9	22	51.2	4.4
36	0	0.0	1	2.3	4	9.3	21	48.8	17	39.5	4.3

(Continued)

TABLE XXX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
37	1	2.3	2	4.7	7	16.3	16	37.2	17	39.5	3.9
38	0	0.0	1	2.3	6	14.0	21	48.8	15	34.9	4.2
Professional Education											
39	1	2.3	1	2.3	9	20.9	20	46.5	12	27.9	3.9
40	4	9.3	2	4.7	14	32.6	19	44.2	4	9.3	3.3
41	2	4.7	0	0.0	10	23.3	17	39.5	14	32.6	3.9
42	1	2.3	2	4.7	13	30.2	20	46.5	7	16.3	3.7
43	1	2.3	2	4.7	9	20.9	23	53.5	8	18.6	3.8
44	1	2.3	0	0.0	2	4.7	22	51.2	18	41.9	4.3
45	1	2.3	2	4.7	12	27.9	19	44.2	9	20.9	3.7
46	4	9.3	6	14 0	19	44.2	13	30.2	1	2.3	2.9
47	1	2.3	1	2.3	1	2.3	14	32.6	26	60.5	4.4
48	2	4.7	1	2.3	14	32.6	15	34.9	11	25.6	3.7
49	2	4.7	0	0.0	1	2.3	17	39.5	23	53.5	4.3

(Continued)

TABLE XXX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
50	1	2.3	0	0.0	8	18.6	15	34.9	19	44.2	4.2
51	1	2.3	0	0.0	5	11.6	15	34.9	22	51.2	4.3
52	0	0.0	3	7.0	5	11.6	15	34.9	20	46.5	4.2
53	1	2.3	1	2.3	2	4.7	15	34.9	24	55.8	4.4
54	1	2.3	1	2.3	12	27.9	17	39.5	12	27.9	3.9
55	1	2.3	0	0.0	2	4.7	11	25.6	29	67.4	4.5
56	5	11.6	0	0.0	6	14.0	19	44.2	13	30.2	3.7
57	1	2.3	1	2.3	5	11.6	25	58.1	11	25.6	4.0
58	1	2.3	0	0.0	5	11.6	21	48.8	16	37.2	4.2
59	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	32.6	20	46.5	9	20.9	3.9
60	2	4.7	1	2.3	8	18.6	24	55.8	8	18.6	3.8
61	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	7.0	23	53.5	17	39.5	4.3
62	6	14.0	2	4.7	15	34.9	13	30.2	7	16.3	3.2

(Continued)

TABLE XXX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
C. **Program Flexibility**											
63	0	0.0	2	4.7	7	16.3	19	44.2	15	34.9	4.1
64	0	0.0	1	2.3	3	7.0	15	34.9	24	55.8	4.4
65	1	2.3	4	9.3	13	30.2	21	48.8	4	9.3	3.5
66	0	0.0	2	4.7	8	18.6	18	41.9	15	34.9	4.1
67	1	2.3	0	0.0	11	25.6	20	46.5	11	25.6	3.9
68	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	11.6	21	48.8	17	39.5	4.3
69	1	2.3	1	2.3	12	27.9	20	46.5	9	20.9	3.8
70	0	0.0	2	4.7	10	23.3	13	30.2	18	41.9	4.1
71	1	2.3	2	4.7	9	20.9	20	46.5	11	25.6	3.9
72	3	7.0	2	4.7	12	27.9	23	53.5	3	7.0	3.4
73	4	9.3	2	4.7	8	18.6	23	53.5	6	14.0	3.5
74	4	9.3	3	7.0	11	25.6	20	46.5	5	11.6	3.3
75	3	7.0	2	4.7	13	30.2	13	30.2	12	27.9	3.6

(Continued)

TABLE XXX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
D. Student Teaching and Professional Internship											
76	2	4.7	2	4.7	3	7.0	23	53.5	13	30.2	4.0
77	0	0.0	1	2.3	4	9.3	15	34.9	23	53.5	4.4
78	0	0.0	1	2.3	4	9.3	17	39.5	21	48.8	4.3
79	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	11.6	28	65.1	10	23.3	4.1
80	2	4.7	3	7.0	13	30.2	15	34.9	10	23.3	3.6
81	2	4.7	0	0.0	10	23.3	21	48.8	10	23.3	3.8
82	0	0.0	3	7.0	10	23.3	19	44.2	11	25.6	3.9
83	0	0.0	1	2.3	9	20.9	17	39.5	16	37.2	4.1
E. Job Placement											
84	4	9.3	7	16.3	8	18.6	20	46.5	4	9.3	3.2
85	0	0.0	3	7.0	6	14.0	25	58.1	9	20.9	3.9
86	0	0.0	2	4.7	2	4.7	17	39.5	22	51.2	4.4
87	1	2.3	2	4.7	0	0.0	23	53.5	17	39.5	4.2

(Continued)

TABLE XXX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
88	4	9.3	1	2.3	1	2.3	22	51.2	15	34.9	3.9
89	1	2.3	1	2.3	2	4.7	16	37.2	23	53.5	4.3
90	8	18.6	20	46.5	7	16.3	8	18.6	0	0.0	2.2
II. RELATED PROGRAMS											
A. Organizations											
91	1	2.3	1	2.3	3	7.0	23	53.5	15	34.9	4.1
92	4	9.3	5	11.6	11	25.6	16	37.2	7	16.3	3.3
93	4	9.3	4	9.3	4	9.3	19	44.2	12	27.9	3.6
94	2	4.7	5	11.6	13	30.2	18	41.9	5	11.6	3.4
95	0	0.0	1	2.3	10	23.3	26	60.5	6	14.0	3.9
96	2	4.7	2	4.7	9	20.9	24	55.8	6	14.0	3.7
B. State Programs and Certification											
97	7	16.3	7	16.3	11	25.6	11	25.6	7	16.3	2.9
98	4	9.3	3	7.0	5	11.6	12	27.9	19	44.2	3.8

(Continued)

TABLE XXX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
99	4	9.3	5	11.6	8	18.6	19	44.2	7	16.3	3.4
100	8	18.6	20	46.5	8	18.6	4	9.3	3	7.0	2.2
101	5	11.6	4	9.3	7	16.3	21	48.8	6	14.0	3.3
102	4	9.3	2	4.7	11	25.6	19	44.2	7	16.3	3.4
103	5	11.6	2	4.7	10	23.3	16	37.2	10	23.3	3.4
104	1	2.3	4	9.3	11	25.6	15	34.9	12	27.9	3.7
105	2	4.7	3	7.0	11	25.6	19	44.2	8	18.6	3.6
106	3	7.0	4	9.3	10	23.3	16	37.2	10	23.3	3.5
107	3	7.0	3	7.0	10	23.3	17	39.5	10	23.3	3.6
C. Cooperating Personnel and Agencies											
108	2	4.7	3	7.0	14	32.6	17	39.5	7	16.3	3.5
109	4	9.3	4	9.3	9	20.9	21	48.8	5	11.6	3.3
110	5	11.6	5	11.6	9	20.9	20	46.5	4	9.3	3.2

(Continued)

TABLE XXX (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
111	3	7.0	3	7.0	4	9.3	26	60.5	7	16.3	3.7
III. ASSESSMENT OF FIRST YEAR TEACHING											
112	7	16.3	1	2.3	8	18.6	20	46.5	7	16.3	3.3
113	2	4.7	2	4.7	3	7.0	17	39.5	19	44.2	4.1
114	7	16.3	6	14.0	11	25.6	13	30.2	6	14.0	3.0
115	5	11.6	3	7.0	4	9.3	22	51.2	9	20.9	3.5

TABLE XXXI

A FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATION OF 42 SUPERINTENDENTS TO THE 115 TEACHER EDUCATION CONCEPTS

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
I. **PRE-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM**											
A. **Selection and Recruitment of Candidates**											
1	3	7.1	0	0.0	14	33.3	19	45.2	6	14.3	3.5
2	2	4.8	1	2.4	18	42.9	18	42.9	3	7.1	3.4
3	1	2.4	5	11.9	11	26.2	13	31.0	12	28.6	3.5
4	1	2.4	4	9.5	20	47.6	10	23.8	7	16.7	3.4
5	1	2.4	3	7.1	23	54.8	10	23.8	5	11.9	3.3
6	1	2.4	3	7.1	14	33.3	17	40.5	7	16.7	3.6
7	3	7.1	2	4.8	17	40.5	18	42.9	2	4.8	3.3
8	0	0.0	5	11.9	11	26.2	19	45.2	7	16.7	3.7
9	4	9.5	3	7.1	11	26.2	17	40.5	7	16.7	3.4
10	3	7.1	1	2.4	6	14.3	16	38.1	16	38.1	3.9

(Continued)

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
11	0	0.0	1	2.4	4	9.5	24	57.1	13	31.0	4.2
12	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	9.5	16	38.1	22	52.4	4.4
13	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	9.5	18	42.9	20	47.6	4.4
14	2	4.8	0	0.0	5	11.9	24	57.1	11	26.2	4.0
15	0	0.0	2	4.8	1	2.4	20	47.6	19	45.2	4.3
B. Curriculum											
16	2	4.8	8	19.0	9	21.4	16	38.1	7	16.7	3.4
17	0	0.0	2	4.8	8	19.0	25	59.5	7	16.7	3.9
18	7	16.7	18	42.9	11	26.2	4	9.5	2	4.8	2.3
19	2	4.8	8	19.0	7	16.7	17	40.5	8	19.0	3.5
20	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	16.7	23	54.8	12	28.6	4.1
21	0	0.0	2	4.8	10	23.8	24	57.1	6	14.3	3.8
22	0	0.0	1	2.4	10	23.8	22	52.4	9	21.4	3.9
23	1	2.4	7	16.7	14	33.3	15	35.7	5	11.9	3.4

(Continued)

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
Technical Agriculture											
24	4	9.5	1	2.4	8	19.0	17	40.5	12	28.6	3.7
25	2	4.8	2	4.8	15	35.7	19	45.2	4	9.5	3.5
26	2	4.8	2	4.8	10	23.8	19	45.2	9	21.4	3.7
27	1	2.4	1	2.4	7	16.7	23	54.8	10	23.8	3.9
28	0	0.0	1	2.4	5	11.9	14	33.3	22	52.4	4.5
29	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.8	15	35.7	25	59.5	4.5
30	0	0.0	1	2.4	2	4.8	18	42.9	21	50.0	4.4
31	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	7.1	22	52.4	17	40.5	4.3
32	0	0.0	1	2.4	2	4.8	22	52.4	17	40.5	4.4
33	1	2.4	2	4.8	9	21.4	17	40.5	13	31.0	3.9
34	1	2.4	2	4.8	8	19.0	22	52.4	9	21.4	3.8
35	1	2.4	0	0.0	4	9.5	20	47.6	17	40.5	4.2
36	1	2.4	2	4.8	7	16.7	15	35.7	17	40.5	4.0

(Continued)

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
37	0	0.0	2	4.8	9	21.4	18	42.9	13	31.0	4.0
38	0	0.0	1	2.4	5	11.9	20	47.6	16	38.1	4.2
Professional Education											
39	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	11.9	22	52.4	15	35.7	4.2
40	5	11.9	1	2.4	12	28.6	15	35.7	9	21.4	3.4
41	1	2.4	1	2.4	6	14.3	17	40.5	17	40.5	4.1
42	0	0.0	3	7.1	10	23.8	26	61.9	3	7.1	3.7
43	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	19.0	27	64.3	7	16.7	4.0
44	0	0.0	1	2.4	3	7.1	19	45.2	19	45.2	4.3
45	1	2.4	5	11.9	8	19.0	20	47.6	8	19.0	3.7
46	1	2.4	9	21.4	20	47.6	10	23.8	2	4.8	3.0
47	1	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	23.8	31	73.8	4.6
48	0	0.0	1	2.4	8	19.0	24	57.1	9	21.4	4.0
49	0	0.0	1	2.4	2	4.8	12	28.6	27	64.3	4.5

(Continued)

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
50	0	0.0	1	2.4	4	9.5	21	50.0	16	38.1	4.2
51	0	0.0	1	2.4	3	7.1	9	21.4	29	69.0	4.6
52	0	0.0	2	4.8	6	14.3	22	52.4	12	28.6	4.0
53	0	0.0	1	2.4	0	0.0	18	42.9	23	54.8	4.6
54	1	2.4	3	7.1	9	21.4	20	47.6	9	21.4	3.8
55	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.4	14	33.3	27	64.3	4.6
56	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	16.7	20	47.6	15	35.7	4.2
57	0	0.0	1	2.4	4	9.5	18	42.9	19	45.2	4.3
58	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.8	20	47.6	20	47.6	4.4
59	0	0.0	3	7.1	12	28.6	22	52.4	5	11.9	3.7
60	1	2.4	0	0.0	6	14.3	29	69.0	6	14.3	3.9
61	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	7.1	26	61.9	13	31.0	4.2
62	3	7.1	3	7.1	9	21.4	15	35.7	12	28.6	3.6

(Continued)

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
C. **Program Flexibility**											
63	0	0.0	1	2.4	3	7.1	15	35.7	23	54.8	4.4
64	0	0.0	1	2.4	1	2.4	12	28.6	28	66.7	4.6
65	1	2.4	6	14.3	13	31.0	16	38.1	6	14.3	3.5
66	0	0.0	1	2.4	10	23.8	15	35.7	16	38.1	4.1
67	0	0.0	1	2.4	5	11.9	26	61.9	10	23.8	4.1
68	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	11.9	18	42.9	19	45.2	4.3
69	1	2.4	2	4.8	5	11.9	19	45.2	15	35.7	4.0
70	2	4.8	0	0.0	7	16.7	14	33.3	19	45.2	4.1
71	0	0.0	1	2.4	9	21.4	20	47.6	12	28.6	4.0
72	2	4.8	0	0.0	12	28.6	17	40.5	11	26.2	3.8
73	2	4.8	0	0.0	12	28.6	15	35.7	13	31.0	3.8
74	3	7.1	3	7.1	6	14.3	10	23.8	20	47.6	4.0
75	1	2.4	3	7.1	5	11.9	18	42.9	15	35.7	4.0

(Continued)

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
D. **Student Teaching and Professional Internship**											
76	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	7.1	22	52.4	17	40.5	4.3
77	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	9.5	10	23.8	28	66.7	4.6
78	0	0.0	1	2.4	1	2.4	20	47.6	20	47.6	4.4
79	0	0.0	1	2.4	4	9.5	20	47.6	17	40.5	4.3
80	1	2.4	1	2.4	7	16.7	15	35.7	18	42.9	4.1
81	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	7.1	17	40.5	22	52.4	4.5
82	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	7.1	20	47.6	19	45.2	4.4
83	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	9.5	21	50.0	17	40.5	4.3
E. **Job Placement**											
84	1	2.4	5	11.9	12	28.6	18	42.9	6	14.3	3.5
85	1	2.4	2	4.8	5	11.9	18	42.9	16	38.1	4.1
86	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	7.1	16	38.1	23	54.8	4.5
87	0	0.0	1	2.4	2	4.8	18	42.9	21	50.0	4.4

(Continued)

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
88	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.4	18	42.9	23	54.8	4.5
89	0	0.0	1	2.4	3	7.1	17	40.5	21	50.0	4.4
90	5	11.9	15	35.7	7	16.7	11	26.2	4	9.5	2.7
II. **RELATED PROGRAMS**											
A. **Organizations**											
91	0	0.0	1	2.4	5	11.9	21	50.0	15	35.7	4.2
92	2	4.8	3	7.1	8	19.0	16	38.1	13	31.0	3.8
93	2	4.8	1	2.4	4	9.5	14	33.3	21	50.0	4.2
94	0	0.0	4	9.5	8	19.0	21	50.0	9	21.4	3.8
95	0	0.0	2	4.8	4	9.5	23	54.8	13	31.0	4.1
96	1	2.4	1	2.4	7	16.7	18	42.9	15	35.7	4.0
B. **State Programs and Certification**											
97	5	11.9	5	11.9	8	19.0	16	38.1	8	19.0	3.3
98	2	4.8	2	4.8	3	7.1	22	52.4	13	31.0	4.0

(Continued)

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
99	3	7.1	7	16.7	5	11.9	10	23.8	17	40.5	3.7
100	6	14.3	17	40.5	14	33.3	3	7.1	2	4.8	2.3
101	3	7.1	3	7.1	8	19.0	21	50.0	7	16.7	3.5
102	3	7.1	1	2.4	4	9.5	24	57.1	10	23.8	3.8
103	5	11.9	1	2.4	6	14.3	22	52.4	8	19.0	3.5
104	1	2.4	4	9.5	2	4.8	21	50.0	14	33.3	4.0
105	1	2.4	4	9.5	6	14.3	17	40.5	14	33.3	3.9
106	1	2.4	2	4.8	4	9.5	20	47.6	15	35.7	4.1
107	2	4.8	1	2.4	7	16.7	16	38.1	16	38.1	4.0
C. Cooperating Personnel and Agencies											
108	0	0.0	3	7.1	18	42.9	17	40.5	4	9.5	3.5
109	3	7.1	2	4.8	8	19.0	24	57.1	5	11.9	3.5
110	1	2.4	2	4.8	13	31.0	20	47.6	6	14.3	3.6

(Continued)

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Role Activity	Evaluation 0 No.	0 Per Cent	2 No.	2 Per Cent	3 No.	3 Per Cent	4 No.	4 Per Cent	5 No.	5 Per Cent	Mean Response
111	1	2.4	0	0.0	8	19.0	24	57.1	9	21.4	3.9
III. ASSESSMENT OF FIRST YEAR TEACHING											
112	2	4.8	2	4.8	4	9.5	23	54.8	11	26.2	3.9
113	0	0.0	1	2.4	2	4.8	23	54.8	16	38.1	4.3
114	1	2.4	6	14.3	11	26.2	19	45.2	5	11.9	3.5
115	6	14.3	3	7.1	8	19.0	18	42.9	7	16.7	3.3

VITA

Robert R. Martin was born May 27, 1929 in Orange County, Orange, Texas. He received his first year of formal education at the Deweyville, Texas Elementary School. His remaining public school education was obtained at Beaumont, Texas, having graduated from Beaumont South Park High School in 1946.

He attended Lamar Junior College (Now Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont, Texas), for two years. In the fall of 1948, he entered Texas Technological College (Now Texas Technological University, Lubbock, Texas), where he remained until January, 1951.

His undergraduate studies were interrupted by two years service in the United States Air Force as a Physical Training Instructor in the Special Services Division. He was honorably discharged in the Spring of 1953.

Returning to Texas Technological College in the Fall of 1953, he completed the requirements for the B.S. Degree in Vocational Agricultural Education in 1954, and the M.Ed. Degree in Vocational Agricultural Education from the same institution in 1955.

Following ten years of teaching vocational agriculture and mathematics in the public schools of Orange and Beaumont, Texas, he entered Louisiana State University in 1966 to pursue the doctoral program in Vocational Agricultural Education, with a minor in Animal Science.

He was employed as Assistant Professor of Animal Science by Stephen F. Austin State University in 1967, and is in that capacity at the time of this writing.

The author holds membership in various professional, honorary and religious organizations, and is a member of the Methodist Church.

He is married to the former Patsy Ruth Wiltshire of Jasper, Texas, and is the father of three children; Rhonda Ruth, age 3; Reesa Gail, age 7; and Kirk, age 17.

EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: Robert R. Martin

Major Field: Vocational Agricultural Education

Title of Thesis: Emerging Concepts of Teacher Education in Agriculture

Approved:

Major Professor and Chairman

Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Date of Examination:

April 16, 1971